

Ignorance is not an excuse in a clear Big Shirk

BEWARE of Ignorance -it is not an excuse!

Preface

Subjects of work

Part 1

Although people had been living in ignorance, the evidence regarding the fact that, their attribute of mushrik had been valid prior to the Hujjah brought by Nabi

(i) Evidence regarding the validity of the attribute shirk in spite of jahiliyyah before the Nabawi ikama (establishment) of hujjah

- a- The Difference between the Reaching of the Call (dawah) and Understanding it
- b- Prior to the arrival of RasulAllah (saw) the risalah had been interrupted (The era of Fatrah: interval when no Prophet was sent - between two Prophets-)
- c- The Inseparability of the attributes Shirk and Ignorance (jahil)

(ii) The reasons behind the Attribute of Shirk had been Fixed Prior to Hujjah

- a- Misak is an Evidence on Its Own
 - 1- Servants have been Created with the Fitrah to Submit only to Allah (awj)
- b- The Tawhid of Rububiyyah Necessitates the Tawhid in Uluhiyyah this is another hujjah
- c- Misak is Evidence that Shirk is baatil. Wrath (punishment) a Necessity of this is Only After the Arrival of the Nabawi Hujjah
- d- The certainty that the Actions are Attributed as Good or Bad by 'Aql Before the Establishment of Hujjah
 - 1- Surely the Hukm of Shirk and the Attribute of Shirk (Mushrik) is Established Prior to Risalah, 'Ilm and Bayan
 - 2- Test for the Qualified Ones on the Day of Judgment by Allah (swt) who had Not Reached the Hujjah Among the Ahl-Fatrah

Part 2

The transition from shirk to Islam

(i) The Characteristic of Modern Jahiliyyah

(ii) Evidence from the Qur'an regarding the understanding of the Basis of Islam (Asluddeen)

- a- The necessity of cleansing from shirk to be Muslim
 - 1- The Necessity of knowing shirk is haraam and Evil; in order to Repent
- b- The Necessity of Rejecting the Taghout, to have Iman in Allah as a Muwahhid

- c- To be Muslim one must actualize Tawhid of Allah in Hukm -Hukm belongs only to Allah

(iii) Evidence from Sunnah Regarding the Understanding of the Basis of Islam

- a-For the protection of life and properties it is an obligation to know the meaning of kalimat shahada
 - 1- Expressing/ Uttering/ Stating/ Speaking is evidence of Itikad
- b- The Necessity of having Knowledge of the 'Ilm, Amal and Certainty (al-yaqeen) regarding the Requirements of the Shahadah to Validate the Shahadah
- c- For the Protection of Life and Properties it is Necessary to Reject All that is Worshiped other than Allah
- d- The Kalimah Tawhid will only Protect the individual who utters it with the Condition that he Distances from Shirk also in Actions
 - 1- Hukm-i Islam 'Namely Muslim'
- e- The essence of tawhid is knowledge (Marifah) regarding Allah (jj)
- f- It is Impossible to Worship Allah while in 'Shirk'
 - 1- The Conditions of Ibadaah
 - 2- Shirk is the indication of ignorance
- g- 'Ilm is a Necessity Prior to Statement and Amal 'deed'
 - 1- Marifat (knowledge) and Expression is the Necessity of Salvation
 - 2-The condition of Shafaa is Tawhid

(iv) The description of Islam from the scholars

- a- The Necessity of Tawhid for the Validity of ones Islam
- b- The acceptance of Islam necessitates practicing the hukm
- c- The 'Hanif' is the one to Abandons Shirk Knowingly and Intentionally
- d- For Salvation it is Necessary that Tawhid is Actualized Both by Word and Action
- e- Accepting Ahkam from those other than Allah is Shirk in Both Uluhiyyah and Rububiyyah
 - 1- Attesting to the Truth and Obedience are among the Elements of Iman
 - 2- Not Accepting the Hukm from Allah is Kufr without Ikhtilaf

(vi) The principles of Iman and its outline

- a- Iman and Islam Necessitate One Another
 - 1- Avoiding Shirk and Embracing the Ahkam is the Right of 'la ilaha illa Allah'
 - 2- Whoever believes that it is Permissible to Abandon the Submission to the sharee'ah will be Kafir
 - 3- The right of 'la ilaha illa Allah'

- b- 'Ilm and Amal are both Principles of Islam
- 1-The Necessities of Actualizing Iman

Part 3

irtidad and Ignorance not being influential in irtidad

(i) Evidences from the Qur'an regarding ignorance not being influential in irtidad

- a- Ignorance is the Essence and Reason of Nifaq
- 1- Description of the Munafiq
- i- The Types of Munafiq and their Condition
- b- The Hukm of Those Who Mock the Ayah of Allah (awj)
- 1- Nifaq is stable even without Intention and Comprehension
- 2- Whoever speaks alfazl kufr (word of kufr) is kafir in both Dhahir and in Batin
- c- Ascribing the Ayahs which had been revealed Regarding the Kuffar to those (Muslim) who Perform the Same Actions

(ii) Evidence from the Sunnah regarding ignorance not being a barrier in performing irtidad

- a- The hukm of objecting the hukm of RasulAllah (saw)
- 1- The hukm regarding the one who slanders the Prophet
- 2- Words (Statements) and Actions are the Foundation of Executing the Ahkam (hukm)
- 3- The Reasons Amal (actions) go to Waste Although Lacking Intention
- 4- Speaking Regarding Allah without Knowledge is the Base of bid'ah and Shirk
- b- The Special Features of the Khawaarij and its Hukm
- 1- Khawaarij and sincerity in the Deen of Allah
- 2- Khawaarij in the sunnah

- i- Some of Their Attributes and Characteristics
- 3- The Calamity of the Khawaarij is Fasid ta'weel
- 4- The Khawaarij Leaving Deen Quickly
- 5- The Hukm of Khawaarij
- i- The difference between the People of Jamal-Siffin and people of Khawaarij
- ii- Takfir of Khawaarij
- 6- The evidence that in the Hadith: (good) intention is not taken under consideration in irtidad
- 7- Evidences regarding the Khawaarij being kafir
- 8- The reasons for making takfir of the Khawaarij
- i- Revile towards the sahabah will indicate kufr
- 9- Khawaarij and irtidad among ahl-qiblah
- c- The Qadariyyah and Their Hukm
- 1- The Sects of Qadariyyah
- 2- bid'ah is not only one type
- 3- The proof of qadim 'antecedent' 'ilm is evidence against the Qadariyyah
- d- zanaadiqah
- e-With the agreement of the Muslimeen it is kufr to attribute hulul to a given individual
- f- The irtidad of those who do not pay Zakah
- 1- The hukm of those who do not give zakah
- 2- The foundation of the fiqh of Abu Bakr giving the hukm of irtidad and declaring war
- 3- The hukm regarding the zakah rejecters

- g- The application of kufr in the matters of furuuddeen

(iii)The matter of Irtidad in sources from the Salaf

- a- Irtidad
- b- Shirk can not be present along with Islam
- 1-The Description if Irtidad and its types
- c- Most of Irtidad is sourced from ignorance and confusing
- d- The hukm of the one who changes his deen after Tawhid and Islam
- 1- There is an ijma (concensus) among the sahabah that the one who made irtidad would be killed
- 2- Among the ulamaa there is a consensus on the execution of the murtad
- 3- Female apostate
- 4- The child or insane person is not executed for apostasy because they are exempted
- 5- Repentance of the Murtad
- 6- Some other Hukm related with the Murtad
- 7- Punishment of the Murtad

Part 4

Clarifying the Doubts Regarding Ignorance in the matters of asluddeen

(i)Wrongful conclusions extracted from the Qur'an

a-The permit of error does not signify generality

1- The permit of error does not signify generality

i- Evidence from the Book regarding the permit of error not being general

ii- The attribute of ahl qiblah being evanescent

iii- The Permit of mistake regarding those other than kufr

iv- Evidence from the sunnah concerning the issue of the permit of being mistaken not being general

v- Evidences from ijma regarding the permit of being mistaken not being general

vi- The conditions of Ijtihad

vii- Ijtihad can not be made in Muhkam matters

b- Doubts regarding the request of Ibrahim (as) to see how the dead have been given life

1- "We are more liable to be in doubt than Ibrahim..."

c- Producing doubts from the stories of the wife of Ibrahim (as) and Zacharia

(as)

1- Amazed Sara

2- The amazement of Prophet Zakariya (as) after the acceptance of His Supplication

d- Doubts related with Ibrahim (as) and the sky objects

1- Ikhtilaf regarding the prophets' infallibility in matters other than conveying the message

e- The Incident of the Disciples of Isa (as)

f- A Doubt about Dhun-Nun Yunus bin Matta

g- Heresy can only be a matter of question after bayan

1- The heresy prior to bayan (hukm) and the attribute of heresy being stable

2- The Base of heresy is ignorance

3- Punishment can only be mentioned after bayan

4- The heresy which necessitates punishment is only possible after risalah

(ii) Wrongful conclusions extracted from the Hadith

a-The matter of Hidden shirk

1- Shirkul asghar (minor/lesser shirk)

b- The hadith of the slave girl which was tested by RasulAllah (saw)

c- Anas b Nadr (ra) and his opposition to the hukm of RasulAllah (saw)

d- Doubts regarding the statements of Aisha (raa)

1- It is not permissible to delay the explanation (of the ruling) from the time when it is needed

e- Doubts related with the Prostration of Mua'dh (ra)

1- The difference between the sujuud of tahiyya/tadhim (salam/ honouring) and the sujuud of ibadaah (worship)

2- This type of prostration was abolished for us with this incident

f- Clarification of the doubts about the Hatib (ra)'s incident

1- Assisting and aiding the kuffar against the Muslim is kufr

2- The act of becoming a spy against the Muslim which is not kufr

i- Hatib (ra) did not perform kufr but haraam

ii- The Status of the Warriors of Badr

g- Incident of Dhaat Anwat

1- The Difference between requesting from the created and requesting from the Creator through the created

2- The tribe had only requested resemblance!

3- The Difference between Tawhid, bid'ah and Shirk

4-The slave is responsible with tawhid the moment he submits

5- The Tribe of RasulAllah knowing the language of Arabic

6- The situation of the individual who has the intention to sin

i- Suggestion/prompting in iman and what should be said when it occurs to the mind/heart of a man

ii- Thoughts can be divided into different categories

7- Did the ulamaa of Najd call it major kufr?

i- Did Muhammad ibn AbdulWahab excuse the sahabah because they did not act upon their request?

ii- Dhat Anwaat was a way to major shirk

i- Hadith regarding the man who ordered his sons to burn and spread his ashes after his death

1- The hadith

2- The ulamaa on the hadith

i- There is complexity in the dhahir of the hadith

ii- Ibn Taymiyyah on the hadith of ashes/qudrah

3- ta'weel is evidence that the insignificant nass is contradicting an abundant principle

i- This man knew that Allah is qadir to resurrect

4- Final words

(iii)Wrongful conclusions extracted from the statements of the scholars

a- The Mushrik can not be considered as Muslim

1- The Mushrik can not be considered as Muslim

2- Slaves are certainly in one of two states; tawhid or shirk either a muwahhid or mushrik

3- Conditions of ibadaah and its invalidation by shirk

4- Attribute of shirk is constant even before risalah; the evidence for this is aql and fitrah

5- Ignorance is the main reason for shirk being dominant over nafs

6- Ilm is one of the rukn of the iman

*

1- Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) and his students

2- Muhammad ibn Abdulwahhab (ra) and ulamaa of Najd

3- Other scholars

Part 5 Asluddeen and Takfir Related Issues

Preface

Without doubt, in today's modernity there exists a blurred and smoggy condition between kufr, shirk, fisq, bid'ah and iman. The same blur also occurs in the hukm of characterization with these and ifrat and tafrit. In reality the reason behind this blurriness and fuzzy situation is the fact that the faith of iman has been forgotten and in most cases has not even been established. Meanwhile Islam being a path of life; a deen and not only a religion, for all hukm, the only measurement of value is the authenticity of iman regardless of anything else. However those individuals who ascribe themselves to Islam are reluctant to see the importance of this and have blinded themselves with the modern way of life, with influence from the west, individualism, freedom of sin, sovereignty of other human beings, and relentless lifestyles. These individuals have become egocentric and reliant on deviation and tyranny so much that they have convicted themselves into a world of diversion, tyranny, oppression and domination under those who are no stronger, no greater, and no gracious than themselves.

Today the murjia thought has dominated the so called Islamic world. For this reason the thought of irja has become sovereign over the minds of the so called scholars, the so called callers of Islam and the so called seekers of knowledge. The mental initiative has become 'iman is only in the hearts' for those who ascribe to the Islamic religion for the reason that Islam has become only a religion and it has lost its roots of being deen; in the minds and hearts of these ignorant individuals. For this reason, the callers of kufr, oppression and secularism have been able to hide themselves behind screens while watching like hawks over the ignorant that believe and claim to have true faith.

It is such that the flags and pennants of the callers of kufr have been able to float over the sacred lands of Islam and the lands which once belonged to the Islamic dar (land). Further more in every house there are pieces of these emblems which are kept and believed to be sacred meanwhile the children are raised with the very same ideology and the adults mature with this lifestyle.

Surely today humanity is embedded in deep darkness. 'Ilm has begun to diminish and with the non-

existence of any righteous scholar, the acceptance of asluddeen has become a serious problem in individuals. Alongside the misrepresentations of the revealed basics in the guise of scholarship, not explaining properly, tearing the statements of the past scholars, changing them and narrating them in torn proportions also the presence of a deviated group under the guise of religious men, all constitute significant problems while people come face to face with sahih Islam.

As emphasized many times before words and concepts of Islam have been distorted and/or these concepts have been emptied, and they have been presented to masses in different forms. Ignorance is among one of these concepts. Today's talafis carefully maintain on this topic and have become inclined to being the masters of accounting those who are ignorant of Islam to be accounted as Muslim. In this sense the talafis and those who have similar beliefs in matters of irja have published many books one after another trying to prove ignorance can be an excuse in Islam. Their statements can be summerised as the following:

"Ignorance is generally an excuse. The scholars of Islam have especially revealed that ignorance can be an excuse. There are uncountable evidences regarding this matter. The society we live in have been left in ignorance they live unaware of the Qur'an and Sunnah. For this reason making takfir of the society we live in, due to ignorance, is absolutely not the view of the salaf scholars. An attitude as such is no other but Khawaarij."

The so called jihaadis (as always) have attained a path between haqq and baatil. Meanwhile they try to explain ignorance is not an excuse to the murjia, they have come up with some conditions and in general sense besides the belief, ignorance not being an excuse, relying on the usul they have fabricated, they have given place in their books to the belief that ignorance can be an excuse in asluddeen in certain conditions.

To prove their point both sects (talafis and jihaadis) take matters of furuuddeen and penetrate them into asluddeen as if they are of furuuddeen, then they try to show the statements of the scholars regarding acceptable ignorance in furuuddeen to prove ignorance can also be an excuse in asluddeen. The talafis and their associates in irja try to put forward their claims that although the entire community performs shirk; they can not be made takfir of. The so-called jihaadis have come to strange conclusions which no scholar has stated before and although they do not make takfir of the society in general they do make takfir of the so-called Islamic governors and the military forces.

In these books written one after another (as if all had been written by the same penman) the authors have repeated the same things over and over again. In these sources many ayah and sahih hadith have been mutilated regardless of their relation to the matter. In an era which all the basics of wahy exist they have tried to present that to be ignorant of Allah's deen, shirk to Allah (awj) performed out of ignorance are excuses and those who do not even have knowledge of one sahih word concerning the deen of Allah, those who perform shirk to Allah (awj) in all aspects of his life have been excused for their ignorance and have named those who make takfir of them because of this ignorant state they are in and accept them as mushrik and kafir, to be Khawaarij, takfiri and ahl fitnah.

The statements of the scholars of salaf have been watered down and without the fear of Allah (awj) they have been attributed many things they'd never in their life time meant. In an era as such the deen - Muhammad (saw) has brought and the risalah has ended with- is evident and clear. Those unaware of the principles of tawhid and the conditions of deen which are obligated to be known, in a life driven in shirk; the salaf scholars have been tried to be presented as if they excuse these types of individuals because they are ignorant and that hujjah must be established prior to passing the hukm mushrik. Whereas, there are no ayahs, no sahih hadith from RasulAllah (saw), neither a statement from the salaf or khalaf scholars regarding the fact that dawah/hujjah must be established prior to giving the hukm mushrik. This claim is no other than a claim made by a group of ignorant enthusiasts who use the method of watering down, mutilating and destroying the ayah and hadith. The matters regarding individuals being punished on the Day of Judgment or on dunya for their acts due to fortuitous reasons and the naming (giving hukm to) of individuals as mushrik for their actions of shirk are different things.

Today we witness every type of kufr and deviation. This namely Islamic movement is much dangerous and very destructive than outer enemies. The callers of this deviation are using our expressions, and they appear in our shapes. They spread the belief of murjiah and affect every single person. They manipulated the Islamic creed and change it with their corrupted views. They make the reality appear foggy and hard to understand. They do this as if; the books had been revealed, the messenger had been sent, the swords had been drawn, men had been beheaded, the hatred between Muslim and mushrik and the continuous fire of war between the Muslim and kafir was only to utter the kalima: 'La ilaha illa Allah, Muhammadun RasulAllah'; without cleansing from shirk, without actualizing the rejection of the taghouts and without making tawhid of Allah (awj) in associating partners, uniqueness, inclination towards Him, and as the authority of legislation.

Now, it is understood by the society that; a Muslim is an individual who does not even know its meaning, does not practice its necessities, does not cleans from shirk and yet only utters the kalima. Moreover they have made the kalima a key to perform any kind of shirk and deviation freely. According to this sick understanding, once anyone utters the kalima, he is saved and will enter jannah; it does not matter whatever actions he performs. He is only responsible to utter the kalima, and he does not need to fulfill its necessities and requirements. After one utters the kalima, every evil becomes a sin for him and who is not a sinner? Sinners may be forgiven by Allah (awj) or go to jahannam for a limited time only!!! It is because this barren and corrupted belief has the earth overflowed with shirk and mushrik. This storm of shirk and mushrik covers each and every corner. As a result of this, jahl has conquered the world. The ilm of tawhid which is the source of goodness is almost erased from all minds and hearts.

This corrupted view has given birth to another: 'Jahl is better than ilm.' It is because according to this belief; once anyone utters the kalima, even if he denies the kalima with his acts and deeds; even if he worships graves; even if he seeks refuge from the dead during times of abundance and famine; even if he loves them as he loves Allah (awj) or more; even if he prefers the hukm of taghout rather than the hukm of Allah (awj) who is Qahhar... he is not responsible of any of these acts due to ignorance and he is excused. If he dies on this manhaj, he will enter jannah sooner or later. But if the hujjah has been

established to him and he becomes a knowledgeable person and continues to perform any of these acts of deviation mentioned above then he will become kafir. If he dies in this condition he will go to jahannam, and his entrance to jannah will be prohibited. As known most people do not cleans from the badness and they do not obey the orders and restrictions of Allah.

This corrupted opinion reaches this conclusion: 'Ignorance will take to jannah however 'ilm will take to the jahannam.' For this reason many from the so-called Islamic jamaa'ah have stopped their call to tawhid. When they see people in ignorance they do not warn them, they do not establish the hujjah to the ignorant. They let them stay in ignorance so that they can be among the saved ones!!!

In this work of ours we will take in hand the fact that there is no room for ignorance in asluddeen and we will take in hand the matters of excuse in furuudeen; the fields ignorance is accepted as an excuse and the conditions which ignorance is accepted as an excuse which have been designated by the scholars. This work is the translated, edited and compiled version of the book "Ignorance in the light of sharee'ah'.

Regarding this matter while some scholars have stated 'when it comes to iman in Allah (awj) or never performing shirk to Allah (awj) (even if from among the ahl fatrah) no one is excused' others state 'even if from among the ahl fatrah those who do an act of shirk to Allah (awj) will be responsible in dunya and in the akhirah.' Alongside they have stated that those which dawah had not reached and had no opportunity to reach the message will namely be mushrik in dunya but will be tested by Allah (awj) in the akhirah.

Parallel to the strangeness of Islam, fitnah has surrounded the entire globe. Those who have truly adhered themselves to the basis of deen are given the name takfiris/Khawaarij for embracing the basis of tawhid, and those who adhere to the Sunnah are accepted as bid'ah doers (ahl bid'ah). Maruuf is seen as munkar and vise versa. The taghout have successfully disguised themselves as the leaders of the mu'minoon and the zindeeq have disguised themselves as salih and zahid individuals. And as the fitnah grows the bid'ah doers are seen as the ahl Sunnah and moreover the fasiq and the mujrim are mentioned among the equitable and ahl takwa. The deen has been polluted so much that bateel has become haq and haq has become bateel in the minds of the deviated, ignorant individuals who actually ascribe themselves to Islam. Individuals have become captives of their own souls so blinded by the urges of their own existence that they have forgotten, they have become treated harshly and that they have even become enemies of the deen; Islam.

Certainly today individuals are in great ignorance. However those responsible of this ignorance are neither Allah (awj) nor RasulAllah (saw). The only ones responsible of this ignorance are the individuals themselves. The greatest reason for this ignorance is equivalent to the ignorance of the societies left distant from the principles of wahy; the ailment of imitating ancestors... Yes one of the greatest reasons why individuals are distant from the principles of wahy and live lives in deep ignorance is because the society we live in has become infected with the illness of blind imitation. Yet the individuals and societies left ignorant due to imitation of their ancestors will not be excused in the presence of Allah

(awj) for these actions. We see that Allah (awj) states:

“The Day that their faces will be turned upside down in the Fire, they will say: ‘Woe to us! Would that we had obeyed Allah (awj) and obeyed the Messenger!’ And they would say: ‘Our Lord! We obeyed our chiefs and our great ones, and they misled us as to the (right) Path. Our Lord! Give them double Penalty and curse them with a very great Curse!’” (al-Ahzab 33/66-68)

“‘What is the matter with you that ye help not each other?’ Nay, but that day they shall submit (to Judgment); And they will turn to one another, and question one another. They will say: ‘It was ye who used to come to us from the right hand (of power and authority)!’ They will reply: ‘Nay, ye yourselves had no Faith! Nor had we any authority over you. Nay, it was ye who were a people in obstinate rebellion! So now has been proved true, against us, the word of our Lord that we shall indeed (have to) taste (the punishment of our sins). We led you astray: for truly we were ourselves astray.’ Truly, that Day, they will (all) share in the Penalty. Verily that is how We shall deal with Sinners.” (as-Saffat 37/25-34)

Again in the same sense one of the reasons the society we live in has been left in ignorance and distant from Islam due to ignorance, living in shirk and kufr is their excessive insensitivity towards the deen of Allah, their careless attitude towards the bases of wahy and being in completely occupied by worldly matters. Individuals do not have time from performing ibadaah to this world; for proper ibadaah to Allah (swt).

“O ye who believe! Let not your riches or your children divert you from the remembrance of Allah. If any act thus, the loss is their own.” (al-Munafiqoon 63/9)

“Say: If it be that your fathers, your sons, your brothers, your mates, or your kindred; the wealth that ye have gained; the commerce in which ye fear a decline: or the dwellings in which ye delight - are dearer to you than Allah, or His Messenger, or the striving in His cause;- then wait until Allah brings about His decision: and Allah guides not the rebellious.” (at-Tawba 9/24)

One must question; is the distance of today’s society from the principles of wahy greater than those who lived upon ignorance prior to risalah such as the Meccan mushrik or the ahl kitab? If those who had been left with very little crumbs of nabawi hujjah, long spent years between the rasul, swimming in the deep swamp of ignorance responsible of their actions in both dunya and in the presence of Allah, are those from among the society we live in favoured in the presence of Allah (awj) in such way that they are not responsible for their actions? When those living among the ignorant of Meccah are attributed as mushrik what is the privilege of this society, that they cannot be attributed as mushrik? Obviously these things which we have brought to attention are in the open and clear as day. However in order to even think of these, one must have a sound mind. As a matter of fact this work of ours is dawah to those which have sound minds. It is a limited time offer to cleans from ignorance and become Muslim, because time will come and we’ll all die in our own time, yet the akhirah will remain eternal.

When it comes to those who have lost their ability to think, those who do not fear Allah (awj) one bit, to those keen on ignorance even if this work of ours would come to them brought by angels from the sky, they would reject it and continue with their stubbornness. Hence these individuals who deliberately mutilate and destruct the principles of wahy, they are in such state that whether or not they are warned, they will not benefit. Ignorance has become their mode.

“As to those who reject Faith, it is the same to them whether thou warn them or do not warn them; they will not believe.” (al-Baqarah 2/6)

Allahu ta’ala had created mankind, and placed the information regarding tawhid in their fitrah. The entire order of the universe is individual evidences to the existence of the Creator and all stand across us as live visible ayah of Allah (awj). In accordance with the blessing of Allah, before questioning His slaves, He has sent them Rasul informing of what needs to be known and what their responsibilities are. He has never loaded their responsibilities above their strength. In the era which the time between the sent rasul had extended, the last rasul Muhammad (saw) had been sent as a blessing to the entire universe and the Qur'an had been revealed to shift mankind from darkness to light.

Allah (awj) had taken the book He revealed to Muhammad (saw) into protection. Today the book of Allah (awj) still preserves its first freshness and it will be like this until qiyamah. In the same sense the 23 years of example prophet hood of Muhammad (saw) still stands across us today. In the 14 centuries left behind ‘ilm explaining the deen of Allah (awj) has given us volumes of sources, they have left us a great inheritance of culture in every matter in deen. After this, neither the establishment of hujjah can be under consideration nor can ignorance.

Whoever is to fall in shirk as a result of imitating their ancestors this individual will be named mushrik in this world and if he dies upon this shirk he will deserve the punishment Allah (awj) envisioned for the mushrik. Again whoever is to subject to another deen as a result of negligence and staying distant from the book of Allah, if he lives a life upon shirk to Allah (awj) neither his attitude towards those keen on ignorance nor his nonsensical talk will excuse him, this individual will be addressed with the hukm applied to the mushrik. After clear nass and the statements of the ahl ‘ilm regarding these nass, our recommendation to those who try to defend the individuals and societies keen on ignorance, those who do not make the deen of Allah (awj) their deen, those distant from the principles of tawhid, those who live lives within shirk etc. is, to stop trying to defend them with funny and unserious remarks such as ‘we can not call them mushrik before establishing hujjah, their ignorance constitutes excuse’. In spite of this we continue to advise them to stop mutilating and twisting the book of Allah (awj) and the model RasulAllah (saw) and to immediately learn Islam and surrender to it.

“Corruption has appeared in the land and the sea on account of what the hands of men have wrought...” (Room 30/41)

Alhamdulillah a group amongst the ummah stabilized on being haqq and continues their struggle against the ahl-fisq and ahl-dalalah. As a matter of fact neither those who oppose them nor those who are in a

betrayal against them can give harm... Until Allah's command comes. They are still the same today and we ask Allah (awj) to count us as one of amongst them...

"Allah has promised those among you who believe, and do righteous deeds, that He will certainly grant them inheritance of power. Just as He granted it to those before them. He will grant them the authority to practice their religion; the one He has chosen for them and He will replace their state of fear to one of security (provided) they worship Me and do not associate anything with Me. Whosoever disbelieves after this then they are of the rebellious." (An-Nur 24/55)

Surely in bidayah and nihayah hamd is to Allah, the Rabb of the Universe.

Subjects of work

To summarise the matter and aim of this work it consists of four main parts.

In the first part we will emphasize on the matter of the obligation to give the attribute of mushrik even prior to the nabawi hujjah. The attribute and hukm of shirk are established prior to the establishment of shirk. The following evidence proves this: the misak taken in the spiritual world, 'aql and the fitrah of everyone. However, surely the punishment in both this world and in the akhirah is only after the risalah has been established.

In this section these matters will also be touched upon: An individual will be given the attribute of shirk even if he is ignorant and before hujjah reaches him. The difference between the reaching of the call and understanding it. The reasons for this is due to the performed act of shirk. The narrated information and the fard show the individual who is ignorant in matters other than asluddeen will not be made takfir of; unless the message and dawah has reached him. Shirk prior to bayan will necessitate punishment. However this punishment is bound to a condition. This condition is that the message reaches him. Fundamentally the ayah of misak is mustakil hujjah regarding shirk. However it is not mustakil hujjah regarding punishment. This is the view that had been preferred by the ahl sunnah. Here there is no tie between the hukm of shirk and the invalidation of punishment. Only all those who are punished in (darayn) both dunya and in the akhirah are mushrik. However not all that are mushrik will be punished. This is only until hujjah reaches them. Between these two there is absolute difference in general and in particular point. The beauty of tawhid and the evil of shirk is evident and is established in both fitrah and in origin. 'Aql has drawn attention to this and at this point it has warned upon the truth which it had been created on. The performances of evil doings, even before the nabawi hujjah, are ugly sins. After information and bayan it is necessary that those who perform these make tawbah (repent). This is the test on the day of judgement by Allah (swt) for those who did not reach the hujjah.

The second part of this work takes in hand the matters of how the individual upon shirk can enter Islam; attain the attribute of Muslim and how the hukm of Muslim will be practiced.

Generally this section takes in hand the following matters: Description of modern jaahiliyyah. The

tawhid of Allah (awj) in ibadaah and the rejection of any other which is worshiped besides Allah (awj) with the necessity of obedience and the hukm being accepted by Allah (awj) is the condition and requirement of la ilaha illa Allah. With the pronouncement of the shadatayn the hukm of Islam are valid. Of course as long as there is no evidence that there is shirk and itikad are impaired, it will be considered that the conditions of la ilaha illa Allah (awj) are realised upon the one to express this. After this if he is to do anything to invalidate this, the hukm of irtidad will be served. Only will the Muslim Mu'min enter jannah. Legislating halaal and haraam are the most important specifications of Rububiyyah. Whoever attributes this right to himself will have bestowed himself of Rabb. And whoever accepts this will have accepted him as Rabb and made him mabud even if he does not perform salah to it and does not make dua to it in place of Allah. Whoever believes in tawhid and cleanses himself from shirk however embraces the hukm of Allah (awj) and His Rasul (saw) by following his father and ancestors with great nifaq is munafiq. There are a group of attributes of Allah (awj) which are existent upon the concept of uluhiyyah. Whoever is ignorant to them, will be ignorant to Allah; he will not recognise Allah (awj) and will perform ibadaah to another. No matter how much he claims the opposite. Ibadaah to Allah (awj) will only be done with the tawhid in uluhiyyah of Allah (awj) of course with his submission with inclination to Allah (awj) who has no partners. It is necessary to fulfill the requirements of tawhid for permission of making shafaah and to be made shafaah. Islam is tawhid of Allah (awj), ibadaah to Allah (awj) (He has no partner) iman in His Rasul and obedience to them in what they bring. Hanif: is the one who abandons shirk consciously and cautiously and the one who makes tawhid of Allah (awj) in both statement and action. The alamate fariqa between the Muslim and the mushrik is tawhid uluhiyyah. Asluddeen is the general points the risalah had agreed upon. The actualization of salvation in akhirah is dependent on these. These are ibadaah to Allah (awj) who has no partners, with salih amal having iman in Allah, His messengers and akhirah. Iman is knowing by heart, stating with the tongue and acting with the limbs. It will increase with obedience and lessen with evil. 'Ilm and amal are components of iman. The one who does not have iman will not have Islam. In the same sense whoever does not have Islam will not have iman. The first among these is nifaq, the later is kufr which tawhid is not stabilized with it. Whoever rebels Allah (awj) with arrogance with ittifaq will be kafir. And whoever is to rebel with his own desire (shahwa) will not be kafir according to the ahl sunnah. None other than the Khawaarij will make takfir of an individual as such.

The third part of this work contains irtidad, and the explanation regarding ignorance not being a factor of irtidad. After making Islam ones deen in the dhahir, the hukm of the individuals who make irtidad or slide to being ahl bid'ah due to fasid ta'weel or mistakes, the Khawaarij, the qadari and those who do not give zakah being accounted as kafir with ijma and the reasons for this.

In this section the following matters take place: Ignorance is the asl of nifaq and its ailment. Surely it is kufr to openly curse Allah, His book or His nabi. It does not matter if the individual who curses sees this as haraam, halaal or does it because he is unaware of his i'tiqaad. This is the view of the fuqaha and other ahl sunnah scholars who state iman is statement and action. The shahadah uttered without knowledge of its meaning or without acting as it necessitates will not be beneficial. There is ijma regarding this. For the hukm to execute statements and actions are its foundation. If the lawgiver recognized there be punishment right after an action, this punishment will be falling to the crime. This

act will be requisite just for this punishment. Speaking on the behalf of Allah (awj) without knowledge is the source of bid'at and shirk. Bughz (enmity) to sahabah is a sign of kufr of the person who performs. It is kufr without an ihtilaf that rejecting the qadha and qadr of Allah (awj) concerning the issues of 'ilm, order and nahy (prohibition). Whoever rejects the qadr of Allah (awj) in the acts and fate, his degree of kufr is more than the Jews and the Christians. Whoever accepts the irada of Allah (awj) regarding the taqdir, concerning the 'ilm of Allah (awj) of the past, but rejects that He creates the acts of slaves and His irada to the creatures, is a deviated ahl-bid'ah. There is a very well known ihtilaf between the ulamaa regarding the takfir of this matter. It is -with the ijma of Muslims- kufr to allege khulul to a specific person. Generally irtidad occurs with jahl and confusion. It is not an obligation to desire or have knowledge of irtidad to be a murtad.

The fourth and at the same time the last part of the work includes refutations against the talafis and so-called jihaadis regarding the incidents they bring forward as proof for ignorance being an excuse. We will, with the help of Allah (awj), prove that their arguments are not serving to haqq and also we will prove that there is no place for ignorance under the matters of asluddeen.

In this chapter we will take in hand, refute and clarify the claims such: Those who bring the ruhksah – specific permits- regarding the jahl and mistake as general principles; those who accept today's society as ahl-qiblah and claim that ahl-qiblah will not be made takfir of; those who bring proof regarding the hidden shirk and claims that shirk will not take one out of fold of Islam; those who talk about not making one kafir if he makes mistake while reciting Qur'an; the incidents of hawaris of Isa (as) concerning their request for a table from Allah (awj); sujud of Muadh (ra); tha'at al-anwat; sahih hadith regarding the man who advised his family to burn him after death; the incident of the aunt of Anas b Malik (ra); the jariyyah who had been tested by RasulAllah (saw); calling Rabb to the sky objects by Ibrahim (as) etc. We also give an answer to those who stick to only some of the expressions of Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) Ibn Qayyim (ra) and Muhammad b. Abdulwahhab (ra) and claim that these scholars also defend the opinion of theirs; ignorance is an acceptable excuse on the matters of asluddeen. The summary of this chapter is as follows: Ahl-qiblah is the attribute of the one who is hanif; the one who cleans from shirk with the knowledge it is shirk and leaves it for this purpose. Other than the hunafa, the mushrik do not carry this attribute for the reason they do not have the qualification to be ahl-qiblah with having shirk in their aqidah and their lives. The condition for ijtihaad is to be a scholar and carry other conditions of ijtihaad. Also ijtihaad should be limited only for the furuuddeen where there is no hukm of sharee'ah regarding the matter and it should be related for the dhanni (supposed) matters and for the deeds. It is not permitted to delay the necessary explanation during the time of need. The ahl-bid'ah who does not receive takfir is the one to fulfill the necessities and the requirements of tawhid. ta'weel is proof of contradiction of insignificant dogma to a plentiful principle or a stronger proof. Whoever claims that an individual will be excused when he performed shirk with ta'weel, ijtihaad, talqlid or jahl, without doubt his judgment goes against the book, sunnah and ijmaa of the ulamaa. There is asluddeen and furuuddeen in the deen. The difference between ahl-sunnah and ahl-bid'ah regarding the usool are as follows: The usool of Ahl-sunnah is the sahih usool which is compatible with the hanif sharee'ah and it is resourced from it. The usool of ahl-bid'ah is in contradiction to the sahih usool and it is innovated by ahl-bid'ah. Their lack of understanding regarding the matter causes them to classify matters in asluddeen

while they are the matters of furuddeen. Without doubt both Allah (awj) and RasulAllah (saw) draw the limits of asluddeen clearly so there is no room for excuse of not knowing the limits. The invalidated kufr from specific individuals which was invalidated by ulama is valid until the establishment of hujjah. Establishing the hujjah necessitates the punishment. Indeed those who perform these acts, by invalidating the asluddeen, are not Muslim. Major shirk can not be present with Islam. The hukm of worldly matters such heritage, friendship, nikah etc. for those will be the same as kuffar. The hukm of akhirah is different than the worldly hukm. In the akhirah for those who did not reach the hujjah will not get the same ahkam with the kuffar.

Part 1

Although people had been living in ignorance, the evidence regarding the fact that, their attribute of mushrik had been valid prior to the Hujjah brought by Nabi

1- Evidence regarding the validity of the attribute shirk in spite of jahiliyyah before the Nabawi ikama (establishment) of hujjah

First Evidence: The following ayah is the first evidence:

“If one amongst the Pagans ask thee for asylum, grant it to him, so that he may hear the word of Allah; and then escort him to where he can be secure. That is because they are men without knowledge.” (At-Tawba, 9/ 6)

In the tafsir of this ayah Imam Tabari states: “Allah’s word to His prophet is: O Muhammad after the months of haraam have passed, if one among the mushrik I had ordered you to fight against and kill asks asylum from you to hear the word of Allah ‘give him time’: Give him asylum until he hears and until you recite to him the word of Allah. Afterwards take him to where he is going. What is meant here is: After hearing the word of Allah if he does not become Muslim and if he is not influenced by the word of Allah you had read and if he does not accept take him to the place he is going in security...

“That is because they are men without knowledge”

By granting them asylum you must act in such manner so that they listen to the Qur’an. The reason behind taking them to the place they are headed in security is because they are a tribe of ignorance who is not able to comprehend any evidence of Allah. As such, they will not know of the advantages if they are to have iman in Allah nor will they be aware of the disadvantages of sin and crookedness originating against them in abandoning their iman in Allah. (Tabari, Tafsir)

Imam Baghawi states: "Until they hear the word of Allah." Here it is meant they would not know what the advantage and disadvantage is as reward or punishment.

"That is because they are men without knowledge"

They do not know the deen of Allah and tawhid. For this reason they are in need of hearing the word of Allah. Hasan (ra) had said this ayah is muhkam until qiyamah."

Imam Shawkani in his tafsir stated: "...they are men without knowledge..." This means it is because they have lost the beneficial knowledge which distinguishes between khayr (benefit) and sharr (wickedness)."

As seen with the guidance of the Qur'an the nass which is muhkam proves that the hukm of shirk is still valid in spite of continuous and extreme ignorance (jahl). Even in an era which the tracks of sharee'ah have been diminished openly and the path of haq has been erased.

In the explanation Imam Nawawi brings to the hadith of Ibn Jud'an he states: "What had been meant by jahiliyyah is the era prior to nubuwwa. Due to their extreme ignorance they have been given this name."

While Ibn Taymiyyah describes jahiliyyah he states: "It must be known that without doubt when Allah sent Muhammad as an envoy to His creations on earth, the entire nation except for those who survived from among most of the ahl Kitab who died before his arrival, with its Arab and ajam (non-Arab) was in a condition of being exposed to the rage of Allah." *('...Then Allah looked at the people of the earth and disliked them all, the Arabs and non-Arabs among them, except a few from among the Children of Israel.' (Ahmad, Muslim and Nasai))"

In that era, people had been in either of the following 2 states:

1- They were either ahl kitab who embraced the book whether it had been mutilated or not didn't make a difference. Or the traces of some had been lost, therefore they had become unknown and some had embraced a religion abandoned.

2 – Those who fit this group are the ummi either Arab or non Arab. These individuals would idolize stars, statues, graves, monuments and any other thing which they liked and believed would bring advantage to them.

But only these individuals had been within deep ignorance. Within this deep ignorance they believed some words to be knowledge which in reality were only words of ignorance, some acts to be pleasant and salih amal which in reality were only corruption. The intention behind those faces which were reckoned to be chosen in knowledge and action was to either achieve crumbs of knowledge from the turbid 'ilm which had been left from the previous prophets but in the hands of the defeatist or ahl bid'ah; the haq was mixed with baatil, or they dealt with 'ilm which some had been legitimate but most had been fabricated. The owner of this knowledge would only benefit so little. These individuals were

trying to be beneficial with a philosophical attitude. In this sense their efforts were spent on matters of nature, mathematics, and manners. This effort of theirs was senseless because although they had been trying, the knowledge they had was more of baatil than haq.

These individuals had many and deep disagreements among them. Besides evidence and reason have been very distant from the real matter.” (Iktidau Siratil Mustakim, 2)

“It is He Who has created you; and of you are some that are Unbelievers, and some that are Believers: and Allah sees well all that ye do” (at-Taghabun 64/ 2)

Ibn-i Hazm (ra) touched upon this: “For an individual there are only two religions: Islam or kufr, otherwise kufr or iman. Whoever is not Muslim then he is kafir.” (Al-Faslu fi’l-Milal wa’l-Ahwau wa’n-Nihal, 3/276-285) This is proof that even if it is before the arrival of hujjah people in jahl, are kafir.

The Second Evidence: The second evidence is the following revelation from Allah: “Those who reject (Truth), among the People of the Book and among the Polytheists, were not going to depart (from their ways) until there should come to them Clear Evidence” (Al Bayyinah 98/ 1)

Ibn Taymiyyah states: Abu’l Faraj Ibn Jawzi is among the ones who explain this. He states: ‘there had not been from the ahl kitab anyone who performed kufr.’ The Jewish and the Christian ‘among the polytheists’ they were idol worshipers, ‘munfakkina’ meaning those who abandon... The meaning of this is, until bayyinah had come to them they were not to abandon their kufr and shirk. The remark of the ayah is future tense (mustakbal) however its meaning belongs to the past (mazi). Bayyinah is a messenger. The messenger is Muhammad (saw). Considering that he had showed them their straying from the right path and their ignorance...

The explanation of Baghawi is similar to this. He states: “They will put an end to their kufr and shirk. ‘Until bayyinah comes to them.’ The remark of this ayah is mustakbal but the meaning is mazi. This means until open proof (bayyinah) comes to them in other words until Muhammad (saw) comes to them with the Qur’an and shows them their straying from the right path and their ignorance and calls them upon iman and until Allah saves them from their ignorance and straying from the right path.” (Majmul Fatawa 16/483-486)

Shawkani states: “Wahidi said: Allah informs us the kuffar will not end their shirk and kufr until RasulAllah (saw) comes to them with Qur’an and explains to them their straying from the right path and their ignorance. This is explaining a blessing and ending straying from the right path and ignorance.”

This ayah clearly shows that before Muhammad (saw) had been sent and before the evidence from the Qur’an had been revealed the attribute of shirk and kufr was valid for individuals. Just like in the phrases from the salaf both ignorance and shirk salaf had been mentioned together. In reality in the Qur’an they have been described with ignorance and negligence many times. The following ayah is only one of them: “It is He Who has sent amongst the Unlettered a messenger from among themselves, to rehearse to

them His Signs, to sanctify them, and to instruct them in Scripture and Wisdom,- although they had been, before, in manifest error” (Al-Jumua 62; 2)

Tabari stated: “...Our glorious Lord states those illiterates, had gone astray from the right path and were very distant to embracing clear hidayah before an envoy had been sent. This means that He explains hope and desire for those who are strayed from the right path and are in error.” (Tabari)

Ibn Kathir said: “So, Allah -- all praise and thanks be to Him -- sent him when the Messengers ceased and the way was obscure. Indeed it was a time when it was most needed. Especially since Allah hated the people of the earth, Arabs and non-Arabs alike, except for a few of the People of the book, who kept to the true faith Allah the Exalted sent to `Isa bin Maryam, peace be upon him.” (Tafsir)

Some could state that it was already:

Without doubt before the Nabi (saw) had been sent, the hukm that they had been mushrik had already existed. The reason is because, for them the evidence of nabawi risalah was completely valid. The ignorance and negligence they had been in, was not because the evidence had been destroyed, on the contrary it was because they had rejected them.

Whereas the statements of the salaf mentioned above rejects this suspicion. They had described this era as an era of fatrah which the traces of the right path had been erased and the coming of the Rasul had been cut.

a- The Difference between the Reaching of the call and Understanding it

“Verily, those who disbelieve (in the religion of Islam, the Qur’an and Prophet Muhammad) from among the people of the Scripture (Jews and Christians) and Al-Mushrikoon will abide in the fire of Hell. They are the worst of creatures” (al Bayyinah 98/6)

RasulAllah (saw) said: “By the One in Whose hand is my soul, no one of this nation, Jew or Christian, hears of me then dies without having believed in that with which I was sent, but he will be one of the people of the Fire.” (Muslim)

The ulama state that there is a difference between the reaching of the call and understanding the call. It is because anyone who had reached the call even if he does not understand it in the correct manner; he will be counted among those whom the call reached.

Ibn Taymiyyah explained this issue: “And His (swt) statement, ‘...then grant him protection, so that he may hear the Word of Allâh (the Qur’an)...’ (at-Tawbah 9/6) It is known that what is meant is that he hears it with a hearing by which he would be able to understand its meaning. As the goal would not be fulfilled by hearing phrases alone and not being able to understand the meaning. So if he was a non-Arab, it would be obligatory to have translated for him the likes of with which the Hujjah would be

established upon him. And if he was an Arab, but there were uncommon phrases in the Qur'ân which were not from his dialect, it is obligatory upon us to clarify their meaning to him. And if he heard the phrase the way many of the people hear it and he does not understand the meaning, and he requests from us to explain it to him and clarify its meaning to him, then that is (obligatory) upon us. And if he asks us about a question that tarnishes the Qur'ân, we answer it for him, just as, if RasulAllah (saw) was presented with a question from the polytheists, the People of the Book or the Muslims, which they asked about the Qur'an, he would answer it for them." (Al-Jawab as-Sahih Liman Baddala Deen al-Masih, 1/221-22)

Imam Muhammad ibn Abdulwahhab (ra), stated in one of his letters: "In the Name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Most-Merciful. To the Brothers... Salamun 'Alaykum Wa Rahmatullahi Wa Barakâtuh, And to proceed...What you mentioned of the Shaykh's statement, "Everyone who rejects such and such, while the Hujjah has been established upon him" and you are doubtful regarding those Tawaghit and their followers, has the Hujjah been established upon them? This is indeed strange! How can you have doubt about this when I have clarified it for you repeatedly?! For indeed, the one upon whom the Hujjah has not been established: He is the one who is new to Islâm, and the one who was raised in a distant wilderness; or this is the case when the matter is hidden, like Sarf and Atf (a type of magic). So he does not disbelieve until it is made known to him. And as for the foundations of the religion (aslud-deen) that Allah has clarified and solidified in His Book, then indeed the Hujjah of Allah is the Qur'an. So if the Qur'an has reached a person, then the Hujjah has reached him. But the source of dispute is that you have not differentiated between establishing the Hujjah and understanding the Hujjah. For indeed, most of the disbelievers and the hypocrites from amongst the Muslims did not understand the Hujjah of Allâh though it has been established upon them, as Allah (swt) said, 'Or do you think that most of them hear or understand? They are only like cattle; nay, they are even farther astray from the Path' (al-Furqan 25/44) And the establishment of the Hujjah is something, and it reaching (the people) is something (else), while it has been established upon them. And their understanding it is something else. And their (falling into) disbelief is by it reaching them, even if they do not understand it. If this has confused you, then look at his (saw) statement about the Khawârij, 'Wherever you find them, kill them,' (Bukhari) and his statement 'They are the worst killed under the heaven.' (Tirmidhi) And this is despite that they were present in the era of the Sahabah, and a person would look down upon the Sahâbah's acts of worship compared to theirs, and with the consensus of the people that what expelled them from the Religion is inflexibility, extremism and interpretive judgment (Ijtihad), yet they believe that they are obeying Allah, and the Hujjah had reached them but they did not understand it. And likewise Ali, (ra)'s killing of the ones who believed in him (as their god), and (him) burning them with the fire, this despite the fact that they were the students of the Sahâbah, and despite their worship, their prayers and their fasting, and they believed they were upon truth. And likewise the consensus of the Salaf on the Takfir of the extreme Qadariyyah and others, despite their knowledge and their intense worship, and the fact that they believed that they were doing good, but none of the Salaf stopped from pronouncing Takfir on them due to the fact that they did not understand. For indeed all of them did not understand. If you know this, then this which you are upon is disbelief. The people are worshipping the Tawaghit, and opposing the religion of Islam, and they claim it is not apostasy because perhaps they did not understand the Hujjah. All of this is obvious. And the most apparent of what has preceded is [the situation] of those that

'Ali (ra) burned, for it resembles this. As for sending the words of the Shâfi'is and others, then it is not imaginable that you will be reached by more than what has already reached you. So if you have some doubts, then seek that Allah (awj) removes them from you. Was-Salam." (Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah fil-Ajwibah an-Najdiyyah, 10/93-95; ar-Rasailu'sh-Shahsiyya, 244-245)

Shaykh Sulayman ibn Sahman an-Najdi (ra) said, "Our Shaykh, the Shaykh Abdullatif, may Allâh be merciful to him, said, 'And the difference between the establishment of the Hujjah and the understanding of the Hujjah must be known. As whoever has been reached by the Da'wah of the Messengers, then the Hujjah has been established upon him, if he was in a state in which knowledge was possible. And it is not a condition in the establishment of the Hujjah that he understands what is understood about Allâh and His Messenger by the people of faith, acceptance and following of what the Messenger came with. So understand this, as it will remove off of you many misunderstandings regarding the issue of establishing the Hujjah. Allah (jj) said: 'Or do you think that most of them hear or understand? They are only like cattle; nay, they are even farther astray from the Path' (al-Furqan 25/44) And He (swt) said: 'Allah has set a seal on their hearts and on their hearings, and on their eyes there is a covering...' (al-Baqarah 2/7)' I say: And the meaning of his statement, may Allah (awj) be merciful to him, '...if he was in a state in which knowledge was possible.' Then what is meant by it is that he is not lacking a sound mind and the ability to differentiate, like the child and the insane one. Or that he is from those who do not understand what is being addressed to him, and there is no translator present to translate for him, and the likes of those. So whoever is reached by the Message of Muhammad (saw) and reached by the Qur'an, then the Hujjah has been established upon him. Allah (awj) said: '...that I may therewith warn you and whomsoever it may reach...' (al-An'am 6/19) And He (swt) said: '...in order that mankind should have no plea against Allah after the Messengers...' (an-Nisa 4/165) So no one is excused for not believing in Allah, His Angels, His Books, His Messengers and the Last Day. So he has no excuse of ignorance after that. And Allah (swt) has informed (us) of the ignorance of many of the disbelievers, while (at the same time) clearly stating their disbelief." (Kashf ash-Shubhatayn, 91-92)

Ibn Qayyim (ra) said: "The one who has the opportunity of learning the orders and the restrictions of Allah (swt) but does not learn will be counted among those who had established the hujjah." (Madariju's-Salikin, 1/239)

Those whom the call reached and who believed in Allah (swt) alone and did not associate anything to Him, such as; Waraqa ibn Nawfal, Qiss ibn Saa'idah and Zayd ibn 'Amr ibn Nufayl are on the contrary of those whom the call reached and who did not believe Allah (swt) alone and associated others to Him.

Narrated by Ibn 'Umar: "Zaid bin 'Amr bin Nufail went to Sham, inquiring about a true religion to follow. He met a Jewish religious scholar and asked him about their religion. He said, "I intend to embrace your religion, so tell me some thing about it." The Jew said, "You will not embrace our religion unless you receive your share of Allah's Anger." Zaid said, "I do not run except from Allah's Anger, and I will never bear a bit of it if I have the power to avoid it. Can you tell me of some other religion?" He said, "I do not know any other religion except the Hanif." Zaid enquired, "What is Hanif?" He said, "Hanif is the religion

of (the prophet) Abraham who was neither a Jew nor a Christian, and he used to worship None but Allah (Alone)" Then Zaid went out and met a Christian religious scholar and told him the same as before. The Christian said, "You will not embrace our religion unless you get a share of Allah's Curse." Zaid replied, "I do not run except from Allah's Curse, and I will never bear any of Allah's Curse and His Anger if I have the power to avoid them. Will you tell me of some other religion?" He replied, "I do not know any other religion except Hanif." Zaid enquired, "What is Hanif?" He replied, Hanif is the religion of (the prophet) Abraham who was neither a Jew nor a Christian and he used to worship None but Allah (Alone)" When Zaid heard their Statement about (the religion of) Abraham, he left that place, and when he came out, he raised both his hands and said, "O Allah! I make You my Witness that I am on the religion of Abraham." (Bukhari)

Ibn Hajar (ra) in his commentary stated: "In the hadith of Zaid ibn Harith the following is included: 'One of the old Jewish scholars of Sham told me that: In the peninsula of Arab I know one old man who is worshipping Allah which the religion you had asked me. He said: I went to him and he said: It (religion) occurs in your land. Whoever you see is in deviation.'" In the narration of Tabari it is: "In your land a nabi occurred or will occur soon, go back; confirm him and have iman on him..."

In the narration of Ibn Ishaq it is narrated as: "He said, O Allah, if I had known the way of ibadah you like I would have made ibadah to you on the way you like. But I do not know, and he was making sujud on the earth with his hands." (Fathu'l-Bari, 7/144-145) (for more information regarding him see Fathu'l-Bari, 7/144-147; Ibn Kathir, al-Bidayah a'l-Nihayah, 2/230)

Examples for the latter one is the parents of RasulAllah (saw): It was narrated from RasulAllah (saw) that his parents are in Hell. A man said: "O RasulAllah, where is my father?" He said: 'In Hell.' When the man turned away, he called him back and said: 'My father and your father are in Hell.'" (Muslim) Imam Nawawi (ra) said, while commenting on the hadith: "This indicates that whoever died during the fatrah (interval between two Prophets) following the way of the Arabs at that time, namely idol-worship, is among the people of Hell. We cannot say that the message did not reach these people, because the message of Ibrahim (as) and other Prophets had reached these people." (Sharh Sahih Muslim, 3/79) With regard to his mother RasulAllah (saw) said: "I asked my Lord for permission to pray for forgiveness for my mother, and Allah (awj) did not give me permission. I asked Him for permission to visit her grave, and He gave me permission." (Muslim) It says in 'Awn al-Ma'bood: "But He did not give me permission" means: because she was a kafirah (disbeliever) and it is not permissible to pray for forgiveness for the kuffar. Imam Nawawi (ra) commented: "This shows that it is not permitted to pray for forgiveness for the kuffar." (Sharh Sahih Muslim)

Alongside this we will provide evidence of 2 ayahs regarding the fact that before the risalah of RasulAllah (saw) the evidence of the nabawi risalah had been vanished.

b- Prior to the arrival of RasulAllah (saw) the risalah had been interrupted (The era of Fatrah: interval when no Prophet was sent or between two Prophets)

The first ayah: The first ayah regarding the matter is the following word of Allah: "O People of the Book! Now hath come unto you, making (things) clear unto you, Our Messenger, after the break in (the series of) our messengers, lest ye should say: "There came unto us no bringer of glad tidings and no warner (from evil)": But now hath come unto you a bringer of glad tidings and a warner (from evil). And Allah hath power over all things." (al-Maida 5/ 19)

Qurtubi stated: ""making things clear" that their evidence had been cut. So that they do not say no warner came to us. "After the break in (the series of) our messengers" this means fatrah meaning to stop (break). It is stated that a thing became fatr meaning it became calm (stopped). "Upon fatrah" it has been said that this means the calamity between two nabi. Ar Rumani had narrated this from Abu Ali and a group of ahl ilm."

Ibni Kathir said: "Allah sent Muhammad after a period of time during which there was no Prophet, clear path, or unchanged religions. Idol worshipping, fire worshipping and cross worshipping flourished during this time. Therefore, the bounty of sending Muhammad was the perfect bounty at a time when he was needed the most. Evil had filled the earth by then, and tyranny and ignorance had touched all the servants, except a few of those who remained loyal to the true teachings of previous Prophets, such as some Jewish rabbis, Christian priests and Sabian monks. Imam Ahmad recorded that `Iyad bin Himar Al-Mujash`i said that the Prophet gave a speech one day and said, '...Then Allah looked at the people of the earth and disliked them all, the Arabs and non-Arabs among them, except a few from among the Children of Israel.' (Ahmad, Muslim and Nasai)"

Therefore, the Hadith states that Allah looked at the people of the earth and disliked them all, both the Arabs and non-Arabs among them, except a few among the Children of Israel, or a few among the People of the Book as Muslim had recorded. The religion was distorted and changed for the people of the earth until Allah sent Muhammad, and Allah, thus, guided the creatures and took them away from the darkness to the light and placed them on a clear path and a glorious Law. Allah said, (lest you say, "There came unto us no bringer of glad tidings and no warner.") meaning, so that you, who changed the true religion, do not make it an excuse and say, "No Messenger came to us bringing glad tidings and warning against evil." There has come to you a bringer of good news and a warner, Muhammad." (Tafsir)

Tabari stated: ""After the break in (the series of) our messengers" this carries the meaning the era it was inkitaa. The fatrah here means inkitaa to stop (calm). According to this it is said: In an era the coming of any nabi had stopped our envoy came to announce haq and hidayah. "lest ye should say: "There came unto us no bringer of glad tidings and no warner (from evil)"" the meaning of this is that our envoy came to declare to you, so that you would not say an informer or a warner did not come to us. Allah teaches them the following: With the arrival of the rasul they were left with no excuse and hujjah was going to be given to them." (Tafsir)

Shawkani stated: "So that you would not say basher and nazir did not come to us" After the era of fatrah because the Rasul came with bayan it was to prevent from making this detestable statement to cover

their unrighteousness. In summary Allah had said do not make any excuse because without doubt bashir and nazir being Muhammad (saw) had come to you.

The second ayah is the following: "If (We had) not (sent thee to the Quraish),- in case a calamity should seize them for (the deeds) that their hands have sent forth, they might say: "Our Lord! why didst Thou not send us a messenger? We should then have followed Thy Signs and been amongst those who believe!" (Al-Qasas 28/ 47)

Tabari stated: "Our Almighty Lord states: If those who I sent you to were not going say; if before you were sent to them We were to punish them and give them a taste of our punishment for sinning and diving into filth and as a result they would not say: O ye our Lord before punishing us you should have sent us a messenger so that we would subject to the evidence and the ayah you revealed to your Rasul. We could have believed in your divinity and we would have attested to your Rasul of Your commands and restrictions. If they were not to make this statement before we sent you to them, we would have speed up the outcome of their actions of shirk. However We sent you to them to warn them of the outcome in result of their kufr. The aim is that they do not have any excuse left after the envoys." (Tabari)

From az-Zajjaj, Shawkani narrates the following: "The importance of the ayah is as follows: If they were not going to say as such, We would not send them any envoys. Meaning; the reason We send them envoys is to set aside such excuses and crookedness. This is like the following ayah: "Messengers who gave good news as well as warning, that mankind, after (the coming) of the messengers, should have no plea against Allah: For Allah is Exalted in Power, Wise." (An-Nisa 4; 165)

The ayah carries the following meaning: Without doubt if We were to punish them they would say: Although there had been long time between the envoys Allah had not sent us a messenger. They believed this would be an excuse for themselves. Whereas, after the messages of the envoys reached them, they were left with no excuse. However, We had made the hujjah muhkam, we rid the excuses and O Muhammad by sending you we completed our declaration."

Qurtubi: "they might say "Our Lord! If only Thou should have sent us a messenger" if they were not to say this We would not send envoys. It was said that it carries the meaning We would speed up their consequence. However Allah (awj) had said the envoys were sent to rid the excuses of the kuffar."

Qusayri said: The sahih thing is the mahzuf (indirect) of Lawla -which is a particle in Arabic- is understood in the following sense: If perchance it was not like this there would be no need for an envoy to be sent. In reality those kuffar had not been excused. The reason for this is that the news of sharee'ah and the invitation of tawhid had reached them. However there is a reality that it had been a long time between them. For this reason if We were to punish them for their crookedness it is possible that one from among them say: A long time has past since the last envoy had come and would essentially believe this to be an excuse. However the fact that the message of the envoys had reached them they have no excuse. We have rid these weak excuses and made the necessary explanations. Consequently O

Muhammad (saw) we sent you to them for this reason. In reality Allah had made the hukm that He would not hold anyone responsible before completion of bayan, hujjah and before sending an envoy.”

Ibni Kathir stated: “And We have sent you to them to establish proof against them, and to give them no excuse when the punishment of Allah comes to them because of their disbelief, lest they offer the excuse that no Messenger or warner came to them.” (Tafsir)

Baghawi states: ““In case a calamity should seize them” meaning when it seizes them as a consequence and punishment. “For (the deeds) that their hands have sent forth” meaning the things they did like kufr and evil. If they were not to say: “Our Lord! why didst Thou not send us a messenger? We should then have followed Thy Signs and been amongst those who believe”. The answer to the lawla (if) particle is mahzuf (indirect). And it is as such: We would have made their consequence sooner. In summary if they hadn’t set forth the excuse of an envoy not being sent We would have punished them sooner due to their kufr. The meaning of this had also said to be: We would not have sent you as an envoy to them. However again We sent you so people would not have any excuse left in front of Allah after the envoys had been sent.”

From these nass the following is understood: If Mawla subhanahu, was to rush and punish those people before the arrival of the envoy as a result of shirk and sin, they could have suggested they had lived in an era distant from envoys that would inform them of khayr, and keep them distant from shar. For this purpose to keep them from having this excuse Allah sent Muhammad (saw). With this the salaf have made ittifak that they are of the gayr-i Muslim, mushrik and kafir. Yet they will only be punished after the nabawi hujjah. There is ikhtilaf regarding this last matter between the scholars.

Now those people lived in an era distant from envoys; an era of fatrah. In spite of the extreme ignorance they lived in, they were still mushrik.

The third evidence: The shirk of the tribe of Nuh (as); the first shirk that came into existence on earth.

As known for certain Adam (as) had left his offspring upon pure tawhid. Later on shirk spread among his offspring as Ibn Abbas describes it, slowly through evil (shaytan). They became mushrik and upon this Allah (awj) sent Nuh (as). According to the sahih hadith of shafaah he is the first Rasul on earth.

As known, Nuh (as) would address his tribe as mushrik not Muslim. In this context it should be asked where was the envoy before him, which gave evidence (hujjah) to them? So that the attribution of shirk and mushrik could be established upon them. In an ayah Allah (swt) states:

“Mankind was one single nation, and Allah sent Messengers with glad tidings and warnings; and with them He sent the Book in truth, to judge between people in matters wherein they differed; but the People of the Book, after the clear Signs came to them, did not differ among themselves, except through selfish contumacy. Allah by His Grace Guided the believers to the Truth, concerning that wherein they differed. For Allah guided whom He will to a path that is straight.” (Al-Baqarah 2/ 213)

Ibn Kathir reported that: "Ibn Jarir reported that Ibn `Abbas said: "There were ten generations between Adam and Nuh, all of them on the religion of Truth. They later disputed so Allah sent the Prophets as warners and bringers of glad tidings." He then said that this is how `Abdullah read the Ayah... "They all had the guidance. Then: They disputed and Allah sent Prophets. The first to be sent was Nuh."" (Tafsir)

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) stated: "People had been upon tawhid and ikhlas after Adam (as) and before Nuh (as). Just like the ancestor of all human beings Adam (as) had been. Until they fabricated the bid'ah of shirk and began to worship idols. However, Allah had not sent a book or an envoy regarding what they had been acting upon. Shaytan had done this profanity with the doubts he adorned with fasid qiyas and deviated thoughts. A tribe from among them had said: Without doubt the sculptures are the spark of the stars in the sky, the stairway to heaven and exalted spirits. A tribe from among them had the concept and pictured them in forms of the nabi and salih from among them. Another tribe had built these idols upon the spirits of the jinn and shaitan. And another tribe had others views... Most of them were imitating their leader and turning away from the path of hidayah. At that time Allah sent His nabi Nuh (as). He would call them upon ibadaah to Allah without shirk and would keep them distant from ibadaah to any other. Although they would claim they were only doing this so that these idols would bring them closer to Allah and so that they would be intercessors for them in the grounds of Allah." (Fatawa, 28/603-604)

In a narration from Ibn Abbas in Sahih Buhari the following is stated: "All the idols which were worshipped by the people of Noah were worshipped by the Arabs later on. As for the idol Wadd, it was worshipped by the tribe of Kalb at Daumat-al-Jandal; Suwa' was the idol of (the tribe of) Murad and then by Ban, Ghutaif at Al-Jurf near Saba; Yauq was the idol of Hamdan, and Nasr was the idol of Himyr, the branch of Dhi-al-Kala.' The names (of the idols) formerly belonged to some pious men of the people of Noah, and when they died Satan inspired their people to (prepare and place idols at the places where they used to sit, and to call those idols by their names. The people did so, but the idols were not worshipped till those people (who initiated them) had died and the origin of the idols had become obscure, whereupon people began worshipping them." (Bukhari; Fath'ul-Bari, 8/535)

When we look at the expression of Ibn Abbas we see that these idols had not been worshiped in the beginning. The illah (reason) of which they began to be worshipped was due to the disappearance of 'ilm and the spread of ignorance. The reason behind this is that, wherever or whenever the mushrik lives his religion, he believes the idol brings him closer to Allah. Why or how should a slave (abd) get closer to Allah with something he believes is baatil. Likewise the following is a regulation: contrary to rebelling, the source and starting point of shirk is belief. Whereas, the source and starting point of the other is only, desire.

Likewise the adulterer, thief and drunk know that their rebellious behaviour is haraam and ugly. However the force that makes one do these actions is evil desire. Of course this is the opposite of sacrifice, votive offering, du'a and taking refuge. Because the force that makes one do these is not desire it is firm belief in Allah (i'tiqaad).

For this reason it is not possible to see an 'abd that would believe the haraam and ugliness of this shirk and know that this act would drag him to eternal jahannam and prevent him from entering jannah and that it completely destroyed his amal (actions) and yet continues to do this with the intention to get closer to Allah. Now... this is not possible.

c- The Inseparability of the attributes Shirk and Ignorance (jahil)

It should be known that shirk is mates to ignorance and that Tawhid is an inseparable mate of 'ilm (knowledge). Allah states: "...that is the right religion, but most men understand not..." (Yusuf 12/ 40)

Ibni Kathir stated in the tafsir of ayah the following: "and this is why most of them are idolaters" (Tafsir)

The meaning is mentioned in many ayahs that it is the ignorance of most people, it is the fact that they do not know.

"If thou ask them, who it is that created the heavens and the earth. They will certainly say, "Allah". Say: "Praise be to Allah!" But most of them understand not." (Luqman 31/25)

"We created them not except for just ends: but most of them do not understand." (Ad-Dukhan 44/39)

"No men can be its guardians except the righteous; but most of them do not understand." (Al-Anfal 8/34)

In reality reference to these individuals as ignorant and non-knowledgeable is seen in many ayahs. Likewise most of the human race have been referred to as mushrik and deviated in many ayahs of the Qur'an. As seen in the following:

"And most of them believe not in Allah without associating (other as partners) with Him!" (Yusuf 12/106)

"Wert thou to follow the common run of those on earth, they will lead thee away from the way of Allah. They follow nothing but conjecture: they do nothing but lie." (Al-Anaam 6/116)

It is evident that the invariable and clear declarations of the Qur'anic ayah show that without doubt most people perform shirk and ignorance together.

When Allah (awj) states: "Allah forgiveth not that partners should be set up with Him." (An-Nisa 4/48) most individuals claim this is valid for only those who have knowledge and those who are stubborn. However this is only like such in rare conditions. As known ayahs have been revealed not for rare situations, on the contrary they have been revealed for matters which are general.

After Imam Abu Butayn related the following from shaikh ul Islam Ibn Taymiyyah “whoever performs the action of shirk with no doubt is mushrik. He will be invited to repent. If he has repented it is great, if not he will be killed” he said: “With no doubt Imam Ibn Taymiyyah in many places has clarified that an individual who performs any action of shirk will be given the hukm of takfir. Although he had narrated from the ijma of the Muslim he had not distinguished the ignorant etc. Allah stated “Allah forgiveth not (the sin of) joining other gods with Him; but He forgiveth whom He pleaseth other sins than this: one who joins other gods with Allah, Hath strayed far, far away (from the right).” (An-Nisa 4/116) Allah also with the expression of Masih states: “...Whoever joins other gods with Allah, Allah will forbid him the garden, and the Fire will be his abode. There will for the wrong-doers be no one to help.” (al-Maida 5/72) Now whoever claims this avoidance to be particular to only the stubborn (muannid) individuals and excludes the ignorant, the misinterpreters and the imitators (muqallid) with no doubt will have opposed Allah (swt) and RasulAllah (saw) and he will have separated from the path of the Muminoon. Moreover in the books of the fuqaha, the section of ‘the hukm of the murtad’ commences with the following: “Whoever performs the action of shirk to Allah... and they never limit it with the muannid. In reality this is an open matter. Alhamdulillah.” (Al Intisar li Hizb’ il Muwahhidun. Abu Butayn, Al-Shaykh Abdullah ibn Abdurrahman, Al Intisar li Hizb’ il Muwahhidun warRad ala’l Mujadil an’ il-Mushrikeen, 27, Aqidat ul-Muwahhideen wa’r-red ala’d-Dullul wal Muhtadeen.)

Likewise; when Ibn Abbas analyzes the beginning of shirk in the era of Nuh (as) he explains that it began with the disappearance of ‘ilm. He says: “they did not worship idols until those who carried ‘ilm died, this knowledge (information) had been lost and now they were worshiped.” Whereas, this tribe had been upon tawhid at first and they had come from a lineage of muwahhid. Subsequently with the effects of ignorance and ta’weel and their types slowly as a bid’ah from their side without any evidence from Allah shirk began with the deception and slander of drawing them near Allah. In this way they became mushrik. In an environment as such, Allah sent Nuh (as) as a bearer of good news and warner to explain the evidence of the worldly and akhirah punishment of those who oppose. In surah Hud Allah states: “We sent Noah to his people (with a mission): "I have come to you with a Clear Warning: "That ye serve none but Allah: Verily I do fear for you the penalty of a grievous day."" (Hud 11/25-26)

Ibni Kathir said: “Allah, the Exalted, informs about Prophet Nuh (as). He was the first Messenger whom Allah (awj) sent to the people of the earth who were polytheists involved in worshipping idols. Allah mentions that he (Nuh) said to his people, (I have come to you as a plain warner.) meaning, to openly warn you against facing Allah's punishment if you continue worshipping other than Allah. Thus, Nuh said, (That you worship none but Allah.) This can also be seen in his statement, (surely, I fear for you the torment of a painful Day.) This means, "If you all continue doing this, then Allah will punish you with a severe punishment in the Hereafter." (Tafsir)

Everything stated about the tribe of Nuh (as) is also valid for the ummah between two messengers (fatrah). The reason is that every envoy in general meaning is sent with Islam to ignorant and mushrik tribes. Most the time the tribes reject and rebel against them, only some which Allah gave hidayah, believe. Then Allah distants those, from their tribes and after the destruction of those who deny, Allah will allow the muwahhid to survive. From then on, they continue upon tawhid until the time Allah wills

otherwise. Until the 'ilm disappears from them, and leads the way slowly to shirk which then begins. Of course they do this without evidence from Allah, with slander to Allah due to ignorance. In this case Allah will send them an envoy to reunite them from darkness to light, from shirk to tawhid and from ignorance to knowledge. Also to warn them that after the nabawi hujjah if they are to continue their shirk and kufr they will be punished in daraiyn (both dunya and akhirah). This is stated in the following ayah: "Messengers who gave good news as well as warning, that mankind, after (the coming) of the messengers, should have no plea against Allah: For Allah is Exalted in Power, Wise." (An-Nisa 4/165)

What is understood from all of this is that, without doubt the name mushrik is invariable before the message had reached. However, the punishment will be in both worlds; this world and in the akhirah.

Narrating from Muhammad b. Nasir al Marwazi, Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "'Ilm concerning Allah means iman, and ignorance concerning Allah means kufr. As such, knowledge regarding fard is iman; however ignorance prior to the commandment of the fard does not mean kufr. The reason behind this is that when Allah first sent RasulAllah (saw) to the ashab they confessed their iman however after this they did not know the commanded fard. Even so their ignorance of the, to be commanded fard was not kufr. Afterwards Allah sent them the fard. Their confession of these fard and performance of these fard became iman. Nevertheless those who rejected them became kafir for declaring the news from Allah to be untrue. If news from Allah had not come, being ignorant of this would not make one kafir. In the same sense after the arrival of the news if from among the Muslim there was some who did not hear of it, this ignorance would also not make one kafir. However ignorance regarding Allah is kufr, either before the arrival of the news or after." (Fatawa, 7/325)

According to an explanation by the author of Badai'us Sanai, Abu Yusuf narrated from Imam Abu Hanifah: "Abu Hanifah stated: No servant ('abd) has an excuse regarding knowledge of his Rabb due to ignorance. All creatures must know their Rabb and make tawhid. The reason for this is that they see the created sky, the creation of themselves and all things Allah created. When it comes to the fard; regarding those who do not know them and related news had not reached them, means that evidence had not been stable as hukm (ie. an ayah had not been revealed yet, or a hadith had not been stated yet etc.)" (Badai'us Sanai 7/132)

Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "When mentioning Hud (as) He notifies what had been said to his tribe: "... ye do nothing but invent!" (Hud 11/50) Before passing hukm of them with what they had opposed him with, he characterized them as slanderers. The reason for this was because they had taken on other deities besides Allah. Without doubt the attribute of mushrik had been fixed before risalah. Before such risalah they had been making shirk against their Rabb, they had been associating partners to Allah and they had taken on other deities and other nidds. (*Nidds are things which represent that which is loved more than Allah; things which are made into measures. For a thing to be a nidd it does not have to be a special existence.) This shows that these attributes have been fixed before risalah. Just like the names jahl and jahiliyyah. Likewise before the arrival of RasulAllah the era had been called jahiliyyah and those affiliated as jahl. However punishment is not the same, because turning faces was only to run/escape from obedience. Just as the following ayah: "But on the contrary, he rejected Truth and turned away!" (Al-

Qiyama 75/32) And a situation as such is only possible with the arrival of the message.” (Fatawa, 20/37)

The forth evidence: is the following ayah of Allah “(The messengers were sent) thus, for thy Lord would not destroy for their wrong-doing men's habitations whilst their occupants were unwarned.” (Al-Anaam 6/131)

Qurtubi in the tafsir of the ayah explains “...We did this to them because I have never been the destroyer of any land for their zulm. Meaning because of their shirk before sending an envoy. So they would not say neither bashir nor nazeer came to us. It has been said to have the following meaning: I did not destroy any land for the shirk of the shirk doer. This is similar to the following ayah: “...Every soul draws the meed of its acts on none but itself: no bearer of burdens can bear the burden of another. (Al-Anam 6/164) If Allah would destruct them before sending an envoy He would have needed to do this.”

From Baghawi: what we are explaining is a situation related to envoys and those who declare them to be false because your Rabb was not a destroyer of lands with zulm. Meaning no one destructed them with zulm. This means with the shirk of the shirk doer ‘whilst their occupants were unwarned’ meaning in the condition that they were not warned. In summary before an envoy had been sent to them.

From Shawkani: “with zulm” meaning I did not destruct their land for the reason of those who performed zulm. Especially when the inhabitants had been unwarned and an envoy had not been sent. This means without doubt Allah had sent his servants envoys. The reason for this is because before the books had been revealed and before the Rasul had been sent while in a state of no fright and no warning, Allah will not destruct the land of those who rebel with their kufr.”

As understood from the statements of the salaf, this ayah shows that the attribute of shirk had been fixed before the arrival of an envoy and while they had been in a state of unwarned. Only, will punishment occur after risalah.

In the illah of the hukm in Al Araf 7/172-174 it is clearly shown that with this hukm the attribute of mushrik is stable, it is fixed even before hujjah had been established and before the message had been attained only because of being mixed up in shirk. In reality this hukm is general for all nations and creations. It would be beneficial to add that the ulamaa had ittifak regarding the fact that this ayah is mustakil evidence. And they have had ikhtilaf regarding the fact that this ayah is mustakil evidence for punishment. However there are two views concerning this.

This holding of a witness has been referred to as being a statement only by tongue or as the actual state itself. There are two views regarding this also.

These are what the scholars had ittifak over and what they had ikhtilaf over. The purpose behind revealing this is so that minds are not confused and so that the hukm is fitted as muhkam.

2- The reasons behind the Attribute of Shirk had been Fixed Prior to Hujjah

a- Misak is an Evidence on Its Own

“When thy Lord drew forth from the Children of Adam - from their loins - their descendants, and made them testify concerning themselves, (saying): "Am I not your Lord (who cherishes and sustains you)?" - They said: "Yea! We do testify!" (This), lest ye should say on the Day of Judgment: "Of this we were never mindful": Or lest ye should say: "Our fathers before us may have taken false gods, but we are (their) descendants after them: wilt Thou then destroy us because of the deeds of men who were futile?" Thus do We explain the signs in detail; and perchance they may turn (unto Us). (Al-Araf 07/172-174)

Shawkani explains this in this following manner: “We did this so that you would not use not knowing as an excuse or so that you would not blame your ancestors for this and so that you would not excuse yourselves with either of these. In the past they had used both excuses. “We were a generation after them” for this reason we could not reach haq, and did not know the truth. “Are you going to destroy us for those who did acts of bateel?” Because of our ancestors; we are not to blame for our inability of research and our content with our pasts. With this hikmah Allah has taken human beings as descendents of Adam and has made them witnesses of their own attestation and state: We did this so they do not make these statements so that they do not embrace these bateel evidences and attach themselves to such invalid excuse and present it.

Imam Qurtubi narrates from Tartushi: “Although people do not recognize the ahd in this life, without doubt, they are responsible of it. Ibn Abbas (ra) and Ubayy b Ka’b (ra) said the following: ‘His (awj) saying shahidna (we are to be the witness) belongs to ban-i adam (mankind). It means: We, undoubtedly be the witness of You being our Rabb and Ilah.’... ‘Are you going to destroy us for those (mubtil) who did acts of baatil?’ This means: You will not act like such. Indeed muqallid has no excuse regarding the matters of tawhid.” (Tafsir)

Tabari explains this ayah in the following manner: “Our almighty Rabb states: “We made you witness” those who state Allah is their Rabb. The purpose is so that you would not say you did not know on the Day of Judgment. And so you would not say Without doubt we did not know this. We had been not aware of this. Or without doubt our ancestors had performed shirk and we are a generation which came after them...

With an ignorance originating from our ignorance we had followed their path.” (Tabari, 2/713)

Ibn Kathir states: “Allah stated that He brought the descendants of Adam out of their fathers' loins, and they testified against themselves that Allah is their Lord and King and that there is no deity worthy of worship except Him. Allah created them on this Fitrah, or way...Also some from among the salaf and khalaf had stated the following: Without doubt what had been meant by this witnessing is to inform that they had been created with a fitrah of tawhid and inclined to tawhid.” (And later begins to provide

evidence to proof the truthness) "These scholars have stated: What had been meant by witnessing is that the evidence that, they had been created inclined to tawhid is the fact that Allah had made this witnessing a hujjah regarding shirk. If this incident had occurred in reality everyone would remember it so that it could be evidence towards them. If perchance it is said: RasulAllah informing of the matter is sufficient proof for its occurrence. The answer to this would be without doubt the disclaimer mushrik disclaim everything the Rasul brings, this and others. Since this testifying had been made an independent hujjah, the fitrah they had been created upon is a fitrah inclined to acknowledge tawhid. For this reason He says: "lest ye should say" meaning so that you would not say this on the Day of Judgment "we were never mindful" of Tawhid (unaware. Or lest you should say: "It was only our fathers a foretime who took others as partners in worship along with Allah." (Tafsir)

The explanation of Baghawi is: "If it is said how can a testification, not remembered be relevant evidence against someone? It will be answered: Without doubt Allah had established many evidences regarding the truth of the oneness of Allah and the matters His envoys had informed of. Regardless of this whoever denies this is a stubborn invalidator and will mean that hujjah had been presented to him. Furthermore their forgetfulness and not being able to remember especially after the message had been given to them by the miracle proprietor messenger does not nullify relying on this evidence. In the ayah the following is stated: "Our fathers before us may have taken false gods, but we are (their) descendants after them." This means O ye mushrik we made you promise so that you would not say: for certain our fathers before us performed shirk and broke their promise and we are a generation who came after them which means we are their dependents consequently we complied with them. So that you would not make this your excuse shield and say "wilt Thou then destroy us because of the deeds of men who were futile?" Or are You going to punish us for the baatil deeds and ignorance of our ancestors? As you see after Allah had informed of the promise regarding tawhid it is not possible for them to defend themselves with such statements. "Thus do We explain the signs in detail" Meaning we announce the ayahs so that servants will think thoroughly. "and perchance they may turn" they may return from kufr to tawhid.

Ibn Qayyim states: "and made them testify concerning themselves, "(saying): "Am I not your Lord" This means they must state His rububiyyah. An acknowledgement as such that it will be evidence against themselves. Without doubt this statement is such that it will have been brought to them by the tongues of the Rasul. Like in the following ayah: "Their messengers said: "Is there a doubt about Allah, The Creator of the heavens and the earth?" (Ibrahim 14/10) "If thou ask them, who it is that created the heavens and the earth. They will certainly say, "Allah"." (Luqman 31/25) "Say: "To whom belong the earth and all beings therein? (say) if ye know!" They will say, "To Allah!" (Al-Mumenoon 23/ 84-85) There are many similar ayahs in the Qur'an. In these ayahs proof has been provided against them that they had been created with a fitrah that they would acknowledge their rabb and creator, also with this opportunity they are invited to do ibadaah only to Allah without any shirk. In reality this is a method particular to the Qur'an. One of these is the statement of Allah in surah Araf: "When thy Lord drew forth...lest you should say on the day of judgment of this we were never mindful." Here a conclusion has been drawn with their statements against them regarding their shirk in rububiyyah and ibadaah to another. This way it has been requested that they do not present an excuse of not knowing or of

imitating baatil. The reason for this is because there are two principals of deviation: 1- either not knowing haq 2- or either imitating the deviators.” (Ahkamu Ahl dhimma 2/527)

Allah states think about when they are taken out of the loins of their fathers and later when they are being born opposing themselves with the fitrah of acknowledging their creator Allah as Rabb. As you see this acknowledgement is hujjah against them on the Day of Judgment. (Ahkamu Ahl dhimma, 2/562)

“Lest you say” meaning to prevent you from saying or so that you would not say” “of this we were never mindful” meaning of this acknowledgement of Allah being Rabb and that only to Him ibadaah will be done... “Or lest ye should say: “Our fathers before us may have taken false gods, but we are (their) descendants after them”” Allah taa’ala presents us with two evidences here which refute the excuses. 1- So that they would not say they had not been aware of this. Here He declares that ‘ilm is of fitrah and that it is essential. Also that every human being must recognize Him. This comprises the hujjah of Allah; the invalidity of the lack of constraint, moreover the statements aimed at providing evidence of the creator are already of fitrah and essential information. This is hujjah for the invalidity of lack of constraint. 2- Our ancestors had performed shirk prior to us and we are a generation after them. Are You going to destruct us for the doings of those who dived into baatil? They are our mushrik fathers. Or are You going to punish us with the offence of others? Now without doubt it is typical and a necessity of nature that an individual follows his father from art, development, clothing and food even belief; although they had sought their ancestors as a mushrik generation before them, if they had not been predestined with the knowledge of Allah being their Rabb. The reason for this is because the father is who up brings the individual and if the parent had made the child a Jew, a Christian or a Zoroastrian and if he did not carry anything in his mind, fitrah naturally they’d say: we are excused. Those who did acts of shirk was our ancestors. We are a generation after them. Also there was nothing to inform us of our mistakes. Whereas in their fitrah the information regarding Allah being their only Rabb is present means that there is something present to declare the invalidity of shirk; which is tawhid they had made shahadah to, against themselves. When it is like this if they are still naturally going to be followers of their ancestors, their past action and natural fitrah will be definite evidence against this claim and ugly custom of theirs. Meanwhile their fitrah which means Islam is much precious and ranks a higher place before their latter day custom which they try to embrace. The meaning of this is; the mind which tawhid is established in is an open evidence of shirk being baatil all on its own, without the need for any Rasul. For this reason the misak (their word, promise) has been taken as evidence against them in place of any Rasul. This does not contradict the word of Allah in surah Isra “...nor would We visit with Our Wrath until We had sent an messenger (to give warning).” (Al-Isra 17/15) The Rasul will invite to tawhid however fitrah is evidence of ‘aql. Likewise the existence of the creator will be known with it. Even if the risalah of Nabi had not been brought to them as hujjah, this shahadah (misak) is sufficient evidence over their susceptible nafs that Allah is their Rabb. With this, the information relating to this is necessary information for the human race. Infact the hujjah of Allah’s ratification of the Rasul becomes stabled with this. Consequently on the day of qiyamah no one will be able to say: “I had not been aware of this. For this reason this sin does not belong to me it belongs to my mushrik father. He had known that Allah had been his Rabb and that Allah had no partners.” Even if in such situation this individual is not excused for his aimlessness and shirk. On the contrary the punishment he deserves is validated for him. Besides

without doubt Allah will not destruct any without sending them an envoy; even if the individual is the doer of that which necessitates condemning and punishment due to His perfection of mercy and generosity. In reality upon his servants Allah has two separate hujjah. Allah has made these hujjah muhkam over individuals. And without establishing both these hujjah He will not punish anyone. The first is; the fact that Allah has created individuals susceptible and able to acknowledge that Allah is the Rabb, Malik and the creator, also that Allah has the right over his servants. The second is; that Allah had sent envoys. These envoys explain the misak, repeat it and complete it. This way upon individual's both fitrah and the attestation of sharee'ah, are valid. In this case if they do not accept these they will have attested to their own kufr just like in the following ayah: "So against themselves will they bear witness that they rejected Faith." (Al-Anam 6/130) This means the hukm one deserves will only penetrate if he acknowledges and after two witnesses/ hujjah/ evidence are provided." (Ahkam'u Ahl dhimmi, 2/527-570)

1- Servants have been created with the Fitrah to Submit only to Allah (awj)

Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "Alhamdulillah. When it comes to the hadith of RasulAllah (saw) "Every child is born upon the Fitrah, it is only his parents who turn him into a Jew, a Christian or a Zoroastrian" The truth to the matter that Allah has created humans upon this fitrah. This fitrah is the fitrah of Islam. The fitrah which had been created on individuals on the day they had said "Am I not your Lord (who cherishes and sustains you)?" They said: "Yeah! We do testify!" (Al-Araf 7/172) This means breaking loose from baatil convictions and accepting the sahih aqidah, because the essence of Islam is to submit to only Allah not any other. In reality this is the meaning of la ilaha illa Allah. RasulAllah (saw) had given an example for this; he said: "Just like an animal giving birth to a healthy one. Do you see any defect in it." This means the heart being flawless from defects is the well-being of the body. Defects are ugly. In Sahih Muslim in a qudsy hadith narrated from Iyad b Himar RasulAllah (saw) stated that Allah (jj) informed him (saw) that "I have created My servants as one having a natural inclination (hanif) to the worship of Allah but it is Satan who turns them away from the right religion and he makes unlawful what has been declared lawful for them and he commands them to ascribe partnership with Me, although he has no justification for that." For this reason Ahmad b. Hanbal (ra) according to one of his views carried the following thought: When one of the kafir parents of a child has died the child will be given the hukm Muslim because the reasons which will change the nature of his fitrah will have ceased. Again according to a riwayat by him and Ibn Mubarak he stated: "The child will be born with the fitrah of unhappiness and happiness (i.e his fate) he had been created upon." This statement will not negate the first one. Without doubt the child will be born sound. Allah will know that it will do kufr. Therefore in ummu'l kitab he will have to transform into what had been for him. Just like the animal is born sound. Whereas Allah knows it will be defected... Essentially being born upon fitrah does not necessitate they believe in Islam in actual fact. Allah has taken us out of our mothers' abdomens not having knowledge of anything. However here Islam means being created with the fitrah of having sound hearts, being accepting and having the will power. It is as such if there is no effect of a deviator upon him he will remain Muslim. See here as long as there is no barrier to prevent it this 'ilm and power of practice which necessitates Islam is the fitrah Allah had created humans with. (Fatawa, 4/245)

As seen in the expressions of Shaikh ul Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) and is the fitrah Allah (swt) had created humans upon. Without doubt Allah has created all humans upon a fitrah sound of baatil convictions and accepting of haq convictions. If this fitrah is not disturbed most certainly the owner will be Muslim. Shaikh also widely discusses the same issue in his book "Dar'u Ta'arud al 'Aql wa al Naql".

As understood from this, the mushrik has annulled the promise and agreement which had been taken from him. After the quotations regarding the ayah of misak, after the evidence which is muhkam and absolute would there be any need for any other evidence?

After this evidence is there need for another?

After these explanations is there need for any other?

Without doubt the scholars mentioned above have made ittifaq regarding the fact that this ayah is mustakil (self-contained) evidence concerning shirk. For instance Qurtubi states there is no excuse for a muqallid (imitator) regarding tawhid. And Tabari states the carelessness and blind imitation of the mushrik invalidates misak as evidence. Baghawi and Shawkani also state this. Ibn Kathir had considered this attestation mustakil evidence against them in means of shirk. Ibn Qayyim stated: Without doubt by acknowledging rububiyyah hujjah is established. This is the evidence against them from Mawla by the tongue of the Rasul. With this He makes ihtijaj (to reach a conclusion from the nass) and with it He invites them to acknowledge uluhiyyah.

Imam Jawziyya adds on to this and states this is the method of the Qur'an. He states their excuse of carelessness; ignorance and imitation of their ancestors are annulled with un-rejectable open evidence. Likewise without doubt the 'aql they learned tawhid with is evidence invalidating shirk which also leaves no need for an envoy. In reality while in this state the reason they deserve punishment materializes. Only, due to the perfect mercy of Allah which comprises everything this punishment has been bound to the arrival of the nabawi hujjah. This ayah lifts all excuses which mankind can embrace regarding ibadaah to any other than Allah. Surely Allah created the universe so that all would worship Him without shirk. Mankind will be dispatched to akhirah due to this truth which books had been revealed and envoys had been sent. Likewise Allah had prepared jannah or jahannam for those who show faithfulness or no faith to this promise. Before concluding this issue it would be best to clarify a doubt regarding this matter. It is regarding the attestation. This attestation concerns rububiyyah not uluhiyyah. Consequently this is hujjah is not about the shirk in deity (ilah) it is about the shirk in lordship (rabb). Whereas according to most of the scholars from the salaf and the khalaf including Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn Qayyim, and Ibn Kathir, this attestation is metaphorical. This is just to refute that claim by proving Allah had created mankind upon fitrah, because fitrah is Islam. Thus this had been quoted from Ibn Taymiyyah just like when Ibn Qayyim mentions the ayah of misak he quoted from Ibn Abdilbarr (Ahkamu ahl' dhimma)

Ibn Qayyim (ra), did not regard fitrah as mere knowledge of right and wrong at birth but as an active, inborn love and acknowledgement of Allah (swt) which reaffirms His Lordship. He also explained that 'And Allah brought you forth from the wombs of your mothers, knowing nothing...' (an-Nahl 16:78) does

not refer to innate knowledge of Allah (awj) or Islam, but rather to knowledge of the particulars of religion in general which is why the latter type of knowledge is absent at birth. Moreover, fitrah is not merely the capacity or readiness to receive Islam, in which such a condition can be unfulfilled when parents choose Judaism or Christianity as the child's religion; fitrah is truly an inborn predisposition to acknowledge Allah (awj), tawhid and deen al-Islam. (Fathul Bari, 198)

Essentially the mufassir had made ijma that fitrah meant Islam. Likewise the open sahih hadith expresses this. The following hadith of RasulAllah (saw) carries this meaning: "His mother-father (parent) will make him Jewish, Christian or Mazdean (Zoroastrian)." In this hadith he does not mention they will make him Muslim. Likewise the hadith mentioned in Sahih Muslim (upon this nation) is also an absolute evidence for this. There are also other hadith concerning this. Furthermore the explanation Abu Hurayrah makes of surah Rum ayah 30 also carries the same meaning. Apparently Abu Hurayrah (ra), cited this verse after the hadith which means that, in his view, the fitrah of the hadith is the same fitrah in the ayah. The ayah refers to the fitrah as good because the right religion is being described as Allah's fitrah. Thus according to Abu Hurayrah (ra), "fitrah is associated with the deen of Islam." (Qurtubi, Tafsir)

The Laws or the shariahs, which the prophets were sent with, are guiding lights to the essential faith in Allah (swt) which is created in every human being. Furthermore, since this faith comes from Allah (awj), it naturally follows that only laws capable of guiding man back to it must also come from Allah (awj), hence Islam is also called deen al-fitrah, the religion of human nature. That is to say, "fitrah is Islam; Islam is deen al-fitrah": the religion of human nature, because its laws and its teachings are in full harmony with the normal and the natural inclination of the human fitrah to believe in and submit to the Creator.

There is no difference between the fitrah of individual men: all men are endowed with the same or an 'equal' fitrah. The believer is in harmony with his fitrah because his instincts are directed in service of Allah (awj), but the unbeliever is alienated from his fitrah because his instincts are in the service of everything else besides Allah (swt). The reason for man's destruction of himself and his environment is that he has become alienated. Nevertheless, he can overcome this estrangement his will and intellect with the Divine will and knowledge. It is man's recourse to Islam which will enable him to effect such a reconciliation. Fundamentally there is no need for much discussion regarding this issue.

Secondly there is also the belief by the words of many scholars among the salaf and khalaf that, this attestation took place in reality.

b- The Tawhid of Rububiyyah necessitates the Tawhid in Uluhiyyah this is another hujjah

Those who have discovered the pleasure of the Qur'an will know very well that the tawhid of rububiyyah necessitates the tawhid of uluhiyyah. It will also very well be known that the Qur'an invites the mushrik to the tawhid of uluhiyyah, with establishing evidence which concern rububiyyah.

“Verily this Qur'an doth guide to that which is most right (or stable)” (Al-Isra 19/9)

The Qur'an presents many ayah against the kuffar as they confess the rububiyyah of Allah, that tawhid in ibadaah also must be established. In this sense they are referred to, in a questioning style just like their dictation in the invitation to the tawhid of rububiyyah. Meaning when they acknowledge His rububiyyah as a result the Qur'an puts forward the fact with evidence that He also has the right of ibadaah to. By this although they confess that Allah is the only Rabb they are condemned for associating partners to him. The reason for this is because even if they confess that Allah is the only Rabb at the same time they must confess He is the only one who has the right (mustahak) of being worshiped. An example for this is the following ayah:

“Say: "Who is it that sustains you (in life) from the sky and from the earth? or who is it that has power over hearing and sight? And who is it that brings out the living from the dead and the dead from the living? and who is it that rules and regulates all affairs?" They will soon say, "Allah".” Once they acknowledge that Allah is Rabb they have then been condemned for associating others as partners to Allah: “Say, "will ye not then show piety (to Him)?" (Yunus 10/31)

The following ayah is also like this: "To whom belong the earth and all beings therein? (say) if ye know!" They will say, "To Allah!" When they confess they are condemned for their shirk: "Yet will ye not receive admonition?" (Al-Mumenoon 23/84-85)

And after it is continued:

“Say: "Who is the Lord of the seven heavens, and the Lord of the Throne (of Glory) Supreme?" They will say, "(They belong) to Allah." And again after they confess their shirk is thrown in their face and they are condemned: “Say: "Will ye not then be filled with awe?" (Al-Mumenoon 23/86-87)

And then it continues

“Say: "Who is it in whose hands is the governance of all things, - who protects (all), but is not protected (of any)? (say) if ye know." They will say, "(It belongs) to Allah." And again once they confess they are condemned with the following expression because of their shirk: “Say: "Then how are ye deluded?" (Al-Mumenoon 23/88-89)

The same continues in the following ayah:

“Say: "Who is the Lord and Sustainer of the heavens and the earth?" Say: "(It is) Allah." Say: "Do ye then take (for worship) protectors other than Him, such as have no power either for good or for harm to themselves?" Say: "Are the blind equal with those who see? Or the depths of darkness equal with light?" Or do they assign to Allah partners who have created (anything) as He has created, so that the creation seemed to them similar? Say: "Allah is the Creator of all things: He is the One, the Supreme and Irresistible." (Ar-Rad 13/16)

"If indeed thou ask them who has created the heavens and the earth and subjected the sun and the moon (to his Law), they will certainly reply, "Allah". How are they then deluded away (from the truth)?" (Al-Ankaboot 29/61)

And again in the following ayah:

"And if indeed thou ask them who it is that sends down rain from the sky, and gives life therewith to the earth after its death, they will certainly reply, "Allah!" Say, "Praise be to Allah!" But most of them understand not." (Al-Ankaboot 29/63)

"If thou ask them, who it is that created the heavens and the earth. They will certainly say, "Allah". Say: "Praise be to Allah!" But most of them understand not." (Luqman 31/25)

"Say: Praise be to Allah, and Peace on his servants whom He has chosen (for his Message). (Who) is better? Allah or the false gods they associate (with Him)? Or, Who has created the heavens and the earth, and Who sends you down rain from the sky? Yea, with it We cause to grow well-planted orchards full of beauty of delight: it is not in your power to cause the growth of the trees in them." Surely they only had one answer with no other alternative. And that answer was obviously the one who created the heavens and the earth is better than those which have no life. Once their confession is declared they are once again condemned: "(Can there be another) god besides Allah? Nay, they are a people who swerve from justice." (An-Naml 27/59-60)

...There are many ayah in the Qur'an which exemplifies this. Certainly all the questions regarding the tawhid of rububiyyah have been repeated many times with the aim that when they acknowledge this, they will deserve to be condemned. In spite of this acknowledgement there will be no denial. Because the one which acknowledges rububiyyah inevitably needs to acknowledge the tawhid of uluhiyyah. Like in the following ayah:

"Is there a doubt about Allah" (Ibrahim 14/10)

"Say: "Shall I seek for (my) Cherisher other than Allah, when He is the Cherisher of all things (that exist)?" (Al-Anaam 6/164)

Regarding the following ayah Tabari states: "Say: "Do ye see what it is ye invoke besides Allah? Show me what it is they have created on earth, or have they a share in the heavens bring me a book (revealed) before this, or any remnant of knowledge (ye may have), if ye are telling the truth!" (Al-Ahqaf 46/4) Allah taa'la states: O Muhammad (saw) to those from among your tribe who commit shirk say: "O my tribe do you see the idols you worship other than Allah? What have they created on earth? Whereas my Rabb has created the entire earth. Can you show me? You must be calling upon them as your Rabb and Diety for those which they have created. Yes what have they created on earth? So in this state it will be evidence for you to worship them. Surely the evidence for worshipping my lord and allotting uluhiyyah

to Him is because He has created the entire earth and had created them from nothingness. When it comes to the following ayah “or have they a share in the heavens” (Al Ahkaf 46/4) Allah states: O ye mankind do those which you worship have a share in the seven heavens? In this manner so it would be evidence for your worship to them. Surely the evidence of my worship to my Rabb is because He has no partners in creating. Likewise He is the sole creator. Let’s also take a look at the following ayah: “...bring me a book before this or any remnant of knowledge...” (Al ahkaf 46/4) Meaning something before the Qur’an had been revealed to me from Allah; a book which includes the deities and idols you worship had created something on earth or that they hold partnership with Allah in the sky, so that this would be evidence for your worship to them. Because if such thing is true this will be evidence for their partnership in the blessing you are in. In addition you will need to show gratitude and it will be haq for you to serve because only a deity has the strength to create. (Tafsir)

Ibni Kathir stated: “The meaning that is reiterated here is that Allah is the Creator, the Sustainer, the Owner and Provider of this life, all that is in and on it. Hence, He alone deserves to be worshipped, and no one and nothing is to be associated with Him.” (Tafsir) in the commentary of the following two ayah: “O ye people! Adore your Guardian-Lord, who created you and those who came before you, that ye may have the chance to learn righteousness; Who has made the earth your couch, and the heavens your canopy; and sent down rain from the heavens; and brought forth therewith Fruits for your sustenance; then set not up rivals unto Allah when ye know (the truth).”

Regarding this matter Baghawi states: “Worship Him” make tawhid of Him. Ibn Abbas had stated everything in the Qur’an regarding ibadaah carries the meaning of tawhid. “Then set not up rivals unto Allah” meaning do not worship them like you worship Allah” “when ye know” He is one and the creator of all.

Ibn Taymiyyah states: The tawhid of uluhiyyah is the alamate fariqa between the Muwahhid and the mushrik. In fact the before and after (dunya and akhirah) the rewards and punishment are given according to this. Whoever does not come to the presence with the tawhid of uluhiyyah he will be among the mushrik who will eternally remain in jahannam. Surely Allah will not forgive shirk made against Him. Only those others! He will forgive whoever He pleases. When it comes to the tawhid of rububiyyah the mushrik already acknowledge this. But they do ibadaah to others than Allah and they loved them as they loved Allah. In this situation this tawhid of rububiyyah had been evidence against this belief of theirs. If that is the way it is; Allah is the Rabb and Malik of all. There is no other creator and no other Razzaq (provider of provision) so why do they worship (ibadaah) any other besides Allah? Moreover these idols do not have anything created for them nor have they given them provision. Like this, it does not hold the possibility of giving or preventing. On the contrary they are just servants like them. They do not have the strength of being able to damage or be beneficial; moreover no death nor life nor do they have the power to revive. (Fatawa, 14/380)

Ibn Qayyim (ra) stated: “Uluhiyyah is the matter which the rasul invited upon their nation with the tawhid of Rabb (lordship). This means ibadaah and deity (ilah). One of its requirements is this: what the mushrik had accepted was the tawhid of rububiyyah which Allah had drawn conclusions against them.

This tawhid at the same time necessitates the acceptance and acknowledgement of tawhid of uluhiyyah.” (Ighasat’ul luhafan 2/135)

Muhammad b. Abdulwahhab stated: “Surely Rabb taa’la confronts the incorrect path they are on with only the acceptance of tawhid rububiyyah. The reason for this is that if He is the one to manage all on his own, also if no other creation is the owner of even an atom; in this situation how is it that although they accept this, yet they make dua to another.” (Kitab’u Rasail’ish-Shahsiyya min Tarikh’i Najd, 432)

These expressions of the scholars regarding tawhid rububiyyah show it also necessitates tawhid uluhiyyah. Without doubt in the Qur’an, evidence is provided against them with this. Just as they acknowledged the fact that the rububiyyah of another is baatil, in the same sense the uluhiyyah of another is also baatil.

As known the acknowledgment of rububiyyah is the testimony that we are ‘abd (servants). In this context the word Rabb has been derived from the word tarbiyya (manner). Tarbiyya requires the right of legislation –the designation of commands, restrictions, halaal and haraam. Tashri (making laws) requires transmitting this to others, meaning the principle of iman to the envoys. In the same sense rububiyyah necessitates obedience and the acceptance of this rabb inclining to Him and without doing the act of shirk in deity (ilah) making tawhid solely to Him. Basically all these are present in the kalam of Allah: “Am I not your Rabb” (Araf 7/172)

Here Muhammad b. Abdulwahhab attracts attention to one point: Rububiyyah and uluhiyyah unite in some places and separate in others. Like in the following ayah: “Say: I seek refuge with the Lord and Cherisher of Mankind, The King (or Ruler) of Mankind, The god (or judge) of Mankind” (An-Nas 114/1-3) Likewise it is said: The Rabb of the universe and the ilah of the prophets, when He is made one, they will unite. Like the statement of the one who says: “Who is your Rabb...” When this is established the following must be known: the statements of the two angels; who is your Rabb? Means who is your ilah? Because, no one will be examined of the point regarding rububiyyah the mushrik already accept. The following ayahs are like this: (They are) those who have been expelled from their homes in defiance of right,- (for no cause) except that they say, "our Lord is Allah (Al-Hajj 22/40) “Say: "Shall I seek for (my) Cherisher other than Allah, when He is the Cherisher of all things (that exist)?"” (Al-Anaam 6/164) “In the case of those who say, "Our Lord is Allah", and, further, stand straight and steadfast ...” (Fussilat 41/30) Rabb mentioned in these ayah carry the meaning of ilah. Here there is no separation in the sense of the shares of two separated things. Both are the same. This issue must be comprehended well.” (Tarikh ul Najd 259)

This is the declaration of a scholar who has understood the message of the Qur’an. In reality the Qur’an has been revealed according to this foundation.

“Am I not your Lord.” Meaning Am I not your ilah. A hadith mentioned in the sahihayn also explain this in open and clear. According to this to the ahl jahannam the following would be said: If you had gold as much as the face of the earth would you trade it in exchange for the situation you are in? He would say

yes. And the Mawla would say “When you had been in the loins of Adam I had requested something easier than this I had asked you not to associate partners to me. But you turned your face from this.” (Bukhari)

Hafidh from Iyad narrates: “He points out the following with this: “When thy Lord drew forth from the Children of Adam - from their loins - their descendants, and made them testify concerning themselves, (saying): “Am I not your Lord (who cherishes and sustains you)?”- They said: “Yea! We do testify!” (This), lest ye should say on the Day of Judgment: “Of this we were never mindful”: Or lest ye should say: “Our fathers before us may have taken false gods, but we are (their) descendants after them: wilt Thou then destroy us because of the deeds of men who were futile?” (Al-Araf 7/172-173) The one who shows loyalty to this (misak) attestation which had been given when they were in the loins of Adam, after he is born he is surely a mu’min. As known the one who only accepts the rububiyyah of Allah cannot be mu’min. (from the words of Hafidh it should be understood that the attestation taken regarding the tawhid of rububiyyah necessitates the tawhid of uluhiyyah.) And whoever is not loyal he is kafir. The message the hadith presents is: When I took the misak from you I requested this from you. However when you were born you did not withdraw from the act of shirk” (Fath’ul-Bari, Kitab’ur-Rikak, 11/411)

As understood from this hadith the promise (misak) taken from mankind was regarding abandoning shirk against Allah in tawhid uluhiyyah and rububiyyah. The expression is general: “So you do not associate partners to Me” in reality to rid the doubt this much explanation is sufficient. With this the one who reads the Qur’an will understand at ease the misleading notion of the opposite.

Before concluding, the explanations regarding this ayah the connection between this ayah and “...nor would We visit with Our Wrath until We had sent an messenger (to give warning) (Al-Isra 17/15) shall be beneficial. Although there is a connection between these ayahs some believe there is a contradiction between them. There is no need to prove there is no contradiction within the Qur’an. But in order to straighten out the mind of the confused, it would be beneficial to explain and clarify this matter so that the confusion is rid.

c- Misak is Evidence that Shirk is baatil. Wrath (punishment) is a Necessity Only After the Arrival of the Nabawi Hujjah

The attestation (bearing witness) in the misak ayah (Al Araf 7/172-173) is mustakil hujjah for mankind regarding shirk. However the mushrik will only be punished in this world and in the akhirah after the nabawi hujjah (the message of Islam) has arrived.

In the ayah it is stated “nor will We visit our wrath”. It does not say We will not pass the hukm of shirk until the arrival of a rasul. On the contrary the salaf has made ijma that everyone who has done shirk is mushrik whether the nabawi hujjah has reached them or not. Just as there is ijma regarding those who died upon jahiliyyah before the arrival of risalah and the Qur’an, could not be called Muslim. Likewise istighfar could not be done for them either. Surely, the scholars only had ikhtilaf regarding whether they would be punished or not. (Aqidat’ul-Muwahhidin wa’r-Radd a’la’d-Dullal’il-Mubtadeen, 151)

The question of ikhtilaf regarding this had been whether or not they deserved to be punished with the mentioned wrath before the hujjah had been established or is it necessary that the hujjah is established for punishment?

Essentially the greatest evidence regarding the correctness of what had been explained is the salaf understanding of the mentioned ayah. "...Nor would We visit with Our Wrath until We had sent an messenger (to give warning)" (Al-Isra 17/15) the explanation of this ayah is that surely Allah will not punish anyone of His creatures in this world nor in the akhirah before sending an envoy. This envoy will warn and help avoid (inzar and i'zar), they will rebel against this envoy and after this inzar and i'zar if they continue to insist with kufr and sin only then will they be punished. Just as Allah had explained in many other ayah. For example:

"Messengers who gave good news as well as warning, that mankind, after (the coming) of the messengers, should have no plea against Allah: For Allah is Exalted in Power, Wise." (An-Nisa 4/165)

This mentioned ayah and many other like it shows that those of ahl fatrah, because no warner had reached them, even if they do die upon kufr they are excused. A jamaa'ah from among the ahl 'ilm had stated this and another jamaa'ah stated everyone who dies upon kufr are in jahannam even if a warner had not reached them. They had taken this thought from the dhahir of the ayah in the book of Allah and the hadith of RasulAllah (saw). One of the ayah they take upon as evidence is the following: "Of no effect is the repentance of those who continue to do evil, until death faces one of them, and he says, "Now have I repented indeed;" nor of those who die rejecting Faith: for them have We prepared a punishment most grievous." (An-Nisa 4/18) Subsequently it is easy to extend with mentioning other similar ayahs and hadith. Such as the one "my father is in jahannam as your father" as proof that the ahl fatrah mushrik are not excused. This usool is a famous ikhtilaf amongst the scholars. Are the ahl fatrah idolater mushrik in jahannam because of their kufr or are they excused?

In the book Maraki'us-Su'ud the following is explained: the ahl fatrah will not be questioned (responsible) for those of furuuddeen (details). However there is ikhtilaf among the scholars whether or not they are responsible of the essential issues (usul). Nawawi is among those who state the ahl fatrah people who die upon kufr belong in jahannam. Also in the sharh of Karrafi At Tankih it is shown that there is ijma regarding this matter. Likewise the author of the book Nashr ul Bunuud had also mentioned this. Qurtubi, Abu Hayyan, Shawkani and others have stated; this is the opinion of the majority. Mukayyid stated: It seems the correct view regarding the matter are the mushrik excused for being ahl fatrah or aren't they? They are excused due to fatrah on earth (in dunya). However in qiyamah Allah will test them with fire. He will command them to enter fire. At this time whoever jumps in the fire will enter jannah. Essentially this will mean that if a rasul had reached them while in dunya they would have attested to his truth. Whoever avoids from entering it he will go to jahannam and will be punished. This will show that this individual while in dunya would have declared it false/untrue if a rasul had reached him. The reason for this is because Allah knows what they would have done if an envoy had reached them." It must be taken notice of this ittifaq between the ulamaa that whoever has infected themselves with shirk is mushrik, whether or not the message had been established to him. The scholars had only

ikhtilaf regarding the fact whether or not an individual whom the hujjah had not reached will receive punishment or not. There are two views regarding this and the preferred view is that, before the nabawi hujjah reaches anyone an individual will not be punished in this world neither in the akhirah. In reality this is a point which many minds and understandings are mistaken. They believe the ayah "...nor would We visit with Our Wrath until We had sent an messenger (to give warning)" (Al-Isra 17/15) is a reference for the excuse of the individual who has mixed himself in the dirt of associating partners to Allah (shirk). They believe even if the individual is lost within this shirk that he is still Muslim, still muwahhid. They believe he is saved in this world and in the akhirah until the nabawi hujjah arrives at him.

The ittifak of the scholars clearly shows that this baatil claim is incorrect. They state whoever from among the ahl fatrah commits shirk whether this individual had lived in an era which the sharee'ah had been lost or in where the true path had been destroyed an individual as such will be mushrik for annulling his misak and fitrah. Likewise 'aql is a hujjah which certifies this. However they have had ikhtilaf regarding two issues. Will an individual as such be punished in dunya and in the akhirah for his actions? Alongside this the scholars without ikhtilaf have agreed that an individual as such will not be blessed with jannah. And they take the following ayah as evidence:

"The Religion before Allah is Islam (submission to His Will)" (Ali-Imran 3/19)

"If anyone desires a religion other than Islam (submission to Allah), never will it be accepted of him; and in the Hereafter He will be in the ranks of those who have lost (All spiritual good). (Ali-Imran 3/85)

"And they say: "None shall enter Paradise unless he be a Jew or a Christian." Those are their (vain) desires. Say: "Produce your proof if ye are truthful." Nay,-whoever submits His whole self to Allah and is a doer of good,- He will get his reward with his Lord; on such shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve." (al-Baqarah 2/111-112)

Now none of those individuals are nor can be Muslim. And only will the Muslim and the Mu'min enter jannah. Likewise this has been stabilised with a sahih hadith. Also Allah had restricted the entrance of a mushrik into jannah.

"...Whoever joins other gods with Allah,- Allah will forbid him the garden, and the Fire will be his abode..." (al-Maida 5/72)

Ibn Taymiyyah had stated: No one will be saved from the punishment of Allah other than those who make their deen and ibadaah particular to Allah and only make dua to Him. And whoever had not made an act of shirk against Him but has not made ibadaah to Him like Pharoah (firawun) and his likes will have remained behind from ibadaah. Those in this situation are in a worse state than the mushrik. Ibadaah solely to Allah is essential. As this is fard to everyone it is not lifted from anyone. This is general Islam which Allah accepts none other as deen. However Allah will not punish anyone without sending an envoy. As He will not punish an individual as such, He will not permit any other than the Muslim Mu'min into jannah; just as He will not permit the mushrik and those who refrain from ibadaah (mustakbir) into

jannah. Besides all this whoever the message had not reached in this world will be tested in the akhirah. Certainly, only will those who submit to the shaytan, will go to jahannam. Those who have not sinned will not enter jahannam. Allah will not punish anyone without sending an envoy. And those which the dawah had not reached, for instance a child, the insane, or someone who dies as ahl fatrah will all be tested (imtihan) in the akhirah. The nass (evidence) indicate this. (Fatawa 14/477)

These are matters which the ulama had referred to those which the message had not reached (hujjah of dawah had not reached) and the ahl fatrah; those who lived in the era which the risalah had been cut. The era of fatrah is an era which the path of truth had been lost, ignorance has spread and 'ilm had been lifted. With this there wasn't a samawi book which they could refer to or a source they could learn tawhid from. Regardless of all this the scholars had made ittifaq that these individuals had been mushrik. They only differed and had two views regarding their punishment; if they would be punished or not. Now if the misak ayah is not sufficient evidence (mustakil) than with what evidence did the scholars pass the hukm shirk to those individuals?

In this sense after the rasul is sent what is the status of those who fall in shirk? All the rasul has declared is apparent although it is mahfuz. Moreover the ayah of Allah and the hadith of His envoy are read to them day and night. And with many surrounding them who know deen and are describing it everywhere.

It is possible to enumerate the issues in the following manner:

- 1- Surely misak is evidence against ones self it has been taken from mankind and necessitates tawhid rububiyah in the style of tawhid uluhiyyah.
- 2- Surely the misak ayah is mustakil hujjah regarding shirk. However it is not accounted mustakil hujjah regarding punishment.
- 3- Surely the hukm of shirk existed and was established before the arrival of risalah. Besides shirk is ugly, bad and condemned and if the shirk doer insists on his act after the nabawi hujjah his doing is a punishment threatened for both in this world and in akhirah.
- 4- The scholars have made ittifaq about the ahl fatrah who worship those other than Allah that they are mushrik and that they are not Muslim. This is the hukm of ahl fatrah on earth (dunya). They will not be punished in this world nor in the akhirah. However they will not be benefiting from the blessings until they are tested (imtihan) until the 'ilm is dhahir by Allah regarding them. In this sense whoever obeys Allah, will enter jannah and whoever turns his face from Allah will be of ahl jahannam. Islam is the cleansing of ibadaah to other than Allah; it is the concept of the oneness of Allah in ibadaah and deity (ilah). Surely if they will die upon this state they cannot enter jannah. It is peculiar to only the Muslim, the Mu'min. Our desire from Allah the owner of the arsh is to be one of them.
- 5- There is no connection between banishing punishment and the hukm of shirk. The one who is

punished in darayn (both in dunya and akhirah) are all mushrik, kafir. However not every mushrik will be punished. At least not until hujjah is established. In reality there is general, particular and absolute difference between them. Attention must be paid to this difference.

d- The certainty that the Actions are Attributed as Good or Bad by 'Aql -Before the Establishment of Hujjah-

There are three different views regarding the issue of knowing the good or bad of actions.

1- Surely the good and bad attributes of actions are stabilised and even before the arrival of risalah, its consequences are reward or punishment.

2- Surely the attributes of good and bad actions are not stabilised before the arrival of hukm, reward and punishment will not be its consequences.

3- The view of the majority of ahl sunnah is that surely actions are given attributes of good or bad before the arrival of hukm. However punishment will only be a consequence after the arrival of hujjah.

Ibn Taymiyyah states: "When it comes to the tawba and istighfar of the actions an individual has done or hasn't done without knowing the badness of offence in them, before the arrival of an envoy and hujjah Allah says: "...nor would We visit with Our Wrath until We had sent an messenger (to give warning)" (Al-Isra 17/15) A group of ahl kalam and ahl ray has stated this matter is not of 'aql it is a matter of sharrii (hukm). Likewise Mutazila and others such as friends of Abu Hanifah and those others like Abu'l Hattab stated the ayah is general; that Allah will not punish anyone without the arrival of an envoy. Also there is evidence that Allah will only punish against sin. This is the opposite of what those who submit to jahm; the Jabriyya state. They state: He will also punish the non-sinner. A group from among the ahl sunnah also agree to this such as Ashari and others. This is the statement of Qadi Abu Ya'la and others...When it comes to the statement of Allah: "Almost bursting with fury: Every time a Group is cast therein, its Keepers will ask, "Did no Warner come to you?" (Al-Mulk 67/8) Before the arrival of the Rasul the things people did had been bad, ugly and shar. However hujjah will only be established to them with a rasul. This is the view of the majority. Some had said: Without doubt the attribute of badness (ugly) will only be through restriction. This is the statement of those who say goodness and badness will only be established through command (amr) and restrictions (nahy). Just like Jahm, al Ashari and those muntasib from the ahl sunnah and Malik, Shaafi and the friends of Ahmad for example Qadi Abu Ya'la, Abu Walid al Bagee, Abu'l Meali Al Juwayni and others have stated. The view of the majority of the salaf and khalaf is as follows: the shirk and ignorance they had been upon before the arrival of the Rasul was in reality ugly and sharr. However they will only deserve punishment if they do not abandon it after the arrival of the Rasul. Within this frame people had three different views regarding the matters shirk, zulm (tyranny), kizb (lie), and badness. 1- Surely the badness of these is known through 'aql. For this reason they deserve punishment in the akhirah, although an envoy did not reach them. Likewise mutazila and friends of Abu Hanifah had narrated this view from Abu Hanifah himself. Also the view of Abu'l Hattab and others. 2- Before hitaab (i.e addressing with sharee'ah) there had been no badness no goodness or

no shar. Surely badness is a matter which is told not to be done. Goodness again is something that is told to be done. Or that permission is given to be done. Al Ashari and others from the three groups who consent with him have said this. 3-Surely these are things which were also bad, shar and ugly before the arrival of the rasul. Most the salaf and the Muslim carry this view. The book and sunnah also show this. Surely in both of these it is explained that they were shar, bad and sayyiat (offence) before the rasul. Even if they deserve punishment for it after the rasul. It is known that in the sahihayn Hudhayfa stated: "O RasulAllah! We used to be in jahiliyyah (ignorance) and evil, then Allah brought this good to us, so is there any evil after this good? He said: Yes. I said: And is there any good after that evil? He said: Yes, but it will be tainted. I asked: What will taint it? He said: A people guiding others with other than my Sunnah, you will approve of some (of their actions) and disapprove of others. I asked: Then is there any evil after that good? He said: Yes! Callers to the Gates of Hell-Fire, whoever responds to them in that, will be thrown into it." Surely Allah had informed the kuffar of the bad actions they took before the arrival of an envoy. Like in the following ayah: "Go thou to Pharaoh, for he has indeed transgressed all bounds." (Ta-Ha 20/24) "Truly Pharaoh elated himself in the land and broke up its people into sections, depressing a small group among them: their sons he slew, but he kept alive their females: for he was indeed a maker of mischief." (Al-Qassas 28/4) This information is about his state before Musa had been born, and after, when he was young and before risalah had come to him. According to this he is a taghout and a mischief maker. Allah states: "'Throw (the child) into the chest, and throw (the chest) into the river: the river will cast him up on the bank, and he will be taken up by one who is an enemy to Me and an enemy to him': But I cast (the garment of) love over thee from Me: and (this) in order that thou mayest be reared under Mine eye." (Ta-Ha 20/39) This mentioned was Pharaoh (firaun). Although he had been referred to as the enemy of Allah the hujjah hadn't reached him yet. Allah had commanded mankind to make tawba and istighfar for the things they had done. If their actions had been permissible equally, some actions which are forgiven like the acts of a child or the insane, they would not have been commanded to make tawba and istighfar. It is malum (evident) that these are ugly doings. However Allah does not punish with these actions until hujjah has been established. Like in the following ayah: "Alif, Lam, Rar. (This is) a Book, with verses basic or fundamental (of established meaning), further explained in detail,- from One Who is Wise and Well-acquainted (with all things): (It teacheth) that ye should worship none but Allah. (Say): 'Verily I am (sent) unto you from Him to warn and to bring glad tidings:' (And to preach thus), 'Seek ye the forgiveness of your Lord, and turn to Him in repentance; that He may grant you enjoyment, good (and true), for a term appointed, and bestow His abounding grace on all who abound in merit! But if ye turn away, then I fear for you the penalty of a great day'" (Hud 11/1-3) "Say thou: 'I am but a man like you: It is revealed to me by Inspiration, that your Allah is one Allah: so stand true to Him, and ask for His Forgiveness.'" (Fussilat 41/6) "We sent Noah to his People (with the Command): 'Do thou warn thy People before there comes to them a grievous Penalty.'" He said: "O my People! I am to you a Warner, clear and open: 'That ye should worship Allah, fear Him and obey me: 'So He may forgive you your sins and give you respite for a stated Term: for when the Term given by Allah is accomplished, it cannot be put forward: if ye only knew.'" (Nuh 71/1-3) This shows us that even before Nuh (as) had warned them the actions (of badness) had been considered as sin. Again in the ayah it is stated: "To the 'Ad People (We sent) Hud, one of their own brethren. He said: 'O my people! Worship Allah! ye have no other god but Him. (Your other gods) ye do nothing but invent! 'O my people! I ask of you no reward for this (Message). My reward is from none but Him who created me:

Will ye not then understand? "And O my people! Ask forgiveness of your Lord, and turn to Him (in repentance): He will send you the skies pouring abundant rain, and add strength to your strength: so turn ye not back in sin!" (Hud 11/50-52) Allah informs that they are slanderers in many ways. Likewise in another ayah He says: "He said: "Punishment and wrath have already come upon you from your Lord: dispute ye with me over names which ye have devised - ye and your fathers,- without authority from Allah?" (Al-Araf 7/71) Likewise Lut to his people said: ""Do ye commit lewdness such as no people in creation (ever) committed before you?" (Al-Araf 7/80) This shows that this action of theirs was lewdness even before Lut (as) had warned them. This is the opposite of what those who say it was not badness and not lewdness before Lut warned them. Ibrahim Al Halil (as) stated: "Behold, he said to his father: "O my father! why worship that which heareth not and seeth not, and can profit thee nothing?" (Maryam 19/42) This is condemning and speaking ill of the actions before he warned him. Likewise "For ye do worship idols besides Allah, and ye invent falsehood." (Al-Ankaboot 29/17) This ayah informs that they were slanderers before they had been warned. This is the same as the statement of Ibrahim (as) to his people "Behold! he said to his father and to his people, "What is that which ye worship? "Is it a falsehood- gods other than Allah- that ye desire?" (As-Saaffat 37/85-86) All these inform us that bad actions had been considered bad even before they had been restricted and their envoys had restricted them from these actions. If the goodness of tawhid and ibadaah to Allah and the badness of shirk had not been known stable and with 'aql, he would not address them in such manner. Because if it is not they would have been spoken ill of, for something they hadn't done. On the contrary their mentioned actions had been on the same level of eating and drinking. Surely they also had been bad before the restriction. The meaning of badness is not because they had been restricted and because they carried the meaning bad. Likewise Jabriya also says this. In reality in many parts of the Qur'an Al Kareem the badness of shirk and other things they had been upon, had been emphasized to put forth many evidences of 'aql. Meanwhile examples have been given for them. It is stated in the ayah: "When those come to thee who believe in Our signs, Say: "Peace be on you: Your Lord hath inscribed for Himself (the rule of) mercy: verily, if any of you did evil in ignorance, and thereafter repented, and amend (his conduct), lo! He is Oft-forgiving, Most Merciful. (Al-Anam 6/54) "Allah accept the repentance of those who do evil in ignorance and repent soon afterwards; to them will Allah turn in mercy: For Allah is full of knowledge and wisdom." (An-Nisa 4/17) "But verily thy Lord,- to those who do wrong in ignorance, but who thereafter repent and make amends,- thy Lord, after all this, is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful." (An-Nahl 16/119) As explained in great detail in another place although the ignorance of the sahabah, tabi'een and all rebels in the same manner all the situations explained in the ayah, the haramness of the sin comprises those who do not know. This shows that the individual who do these actions have done something bad; regardless of the fact that he hadn't heard of its restriction. So consequently for Allah to show mercy and forgive, they should make tawbah (repent); even though they do not deserve punishment, because the hitab had not reached them and hujjah hadn't been established. In this sense since tawbah and istighfar are done for abandoning the fard (obligations) and doing acts which are not known to be sin, this informs many things which are included in tawbah and istighfar. When tawbah and istighfar are mentioned most people will feel in the frame of their knowledge that, what they had done was bad; like fornication and open zulm. When it comes to the things they had made deen of, they wouldn't know it is a sin except for those who know it is baatil like the invalidated deen of the mushrik and ahl kitab. Surely this is a state which requisites tawbah and istighfar. Where as the one who

commits this act believes to be upon hidayah. The bidaah are also like this. In reality, this sect who do not know the badness of their actions, are a great number within the ahl qiblah. It is also general among the non ahl qiblah. In this sense mankind will abandon some waajib without knowing they are waajib; there are many examples of these. Then they'll learn, that which they've abandoned are among the beauty of tawhid and iman and that they are mukallif (obligated) of making tawbah and that this act of theirs requires istighfar. The one who makes tawbah of this situation will do it for abandoning, missing and negligence of matters from the sharee'ah of Allah. Likewise people will make tawbah of their bad doings. Now, it is like this for those who do this and abandon this, prior to risalah. However after risalah punishment will be deserved. In this manner we have transferred both views. The one which annulled condemnation and punishment and the one which shows these are stabilized. If it is said: if he is not being held responsible what meaning does it carry to accept the action as bad? As an answer it would be said: On the contrary this has two meanings. 1- This is a reason for punishment. However it is also linked to a condition, which is evidence/ hujjah. "ye were on the brink of the pit of Fire, and He saved you from it. (Al-Imran 3/103) If He had not saved they would have fallen in. And whoever stood at the brink of it would be destroyed. The destruction of this individual is his fall. This situation is the opposite of whoever is distant from this situation, will have distanced from destruction. It is known that His (saw) ahab was near destruction and punishment. 2- These individuals are spoken ill of and are in a status of deficiency and shame. For this reason their degrees are low. It has to be like this. Likewise even if it was predestined they would not be punished they will not deserve what those who are clean from such dirt and deserve rewards. Depriving from this khayr is a punishment for them. Generally this is a type of punishment."

The author continues until about page 690 and says: "In another place Allah has united tawhid and istighfar. "Know, therefore, that there is no god but Allah, and ask forgiveness for thy fault, and for the men and women who believe: for Allah knows how ye move about and how ye dwell in your homes." (Muhammad 47/19) Here, the Mu'min are making istighfar for abandoning tawhid of Allah and those regarding ibadaah to Him; even though an envoy had not reached them for those which they had abandoned." (Fatawa 11/675-690)

Again Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) states: "Surely Allah had separated the time as before risalah and after risalah in naming and hukm and has united some in name and hukm. This is hujjah against the following two groups: a-Those who state in actions there are neither good nor bad. b- Those who state they deserve punishment. There are two views in this: in the first situation Allah had attributed them as tyrant, taghout and mischief makers. "Go thou to Pharaoh, for he has indeed transgressed all bounds." (Ta-Ha 20/24) "Behold, thy Lord called Moses: "Go to the people of iniquity,- The people of the Pharaoh" (Ash-Shuara 26/10-11) "...for he was indeed a maker of mischief." (Al-Qasas 28/4) He informs us that he and his nation are tyrants, taghout and mischief makers. These names (attributes) show the actions are spoken ill of. Speaking ill of is only concerning bad and ugly actions. This shows that actions could be bad and spoken ill of even before the arrival of an envoy. However because of the ayah "... nor would We visit with Our Wrath until We had sent an messenger (to give warning). (Al-Isra 17/15) they are deserving punishment after the arrival of an envoy. In this sense He also informs us the statement of Hud (as) to his people: "O my people! Worship Allah! ye have no other god but Him. (Your other gods)

ye do nothing but invent!” (Hud 11/50) Here they oppose a hukm. However before the hukm is established they are attributed to be slanderers because they had made deities out of other than Allah. Fundamentally the attribute/name mushrik is stabilised before risalah. He commits shirk to his Rabb. He makes the equivalent to Allah and takes on other deities. Before the arrival of the rasul he associates partners to Him. This way we see these names had been stabilised before hujjah. In fact the names of jahl and jahiliyyah carry the same meaning. Likewise the era prior to the arrival of the rasul is called jahiliyyah and jahl. However punishment is only after the arrival of the rasul. When it comes to the turning of the face mentioned in the ayah “So he gave nothing in charity, nor did he pray!- But on the contrary, he rejected Truth and turned away!” (Al-Qiyama 75/31-32) a situation as such can only be under consideration after the arrival of the rasul. Like the ayah mentioning Pharoah (firaun): “But (Pharaoh) rejected it and disobeyed (guidance)” (an-Naziat 79/21) this had happened after the arrival of the rasul. Likewise in the ayah it is mentioned that “Then did (Moses) show him the Great Sign. But (Pharaoh) rejected it and disobeyed (guidance)” (an-Naziat 79/20-21) “But Pharaoh disobeyed the messenger; so We seized him with a heavy Punishment.” (Al-Muzzammil 73/16)” (Fatawa, 20/37-38)

Ibn Qayyim states: there are two situations opposite of one another which one is not the conclusion of the other: 1- Is the action itself inclusive of an attribution which necessitates beautiful/ good (husn) and ugly/ bad (kubh) –as husn and kubh would originate from it-? Consequently will it be a source for both or not? 2- Is the husn which necessitates reward and the kubh which necessitates punishment absolutely stable? Moreover is it a reality of ‘aql? Or will it occur with the arrival of a sharri hukm? The reality of the contradiction which is distant from it; is: between these there is no necessitation. Actions are either good or bad themselves. Just like beneficial and harmful. However without commands and restriction it will not conclude with reward and punishment. In the same manner it is the same before the arrival of commands and restrictions. Although it is bad itself moreover it is only badness, this badness does not necessitate punishment. Allah will not punish before sending an envoy. Essentially making sajda to the shaytan and idols, lying, fornication, tyranny and badness are all bad themselves. However the punishment these necessitate are reported with the hukm of sharee'ah. Those who oppose this, state: These are not badness themselves. Their badness and their necessitation originate from sharee'ah. Mu'tazila states: The evil in these and its punishment are stable by 'aql. Many fuqaha and the four madhhab state: The evil in these are stable by 'aql. However the punishment they necessitate are recorded with the hukm of sharee'ah. From the Shaaafi Sad b. Ali az Zanjane, from the Hanbali Abu'l Hattab and also the Hanafis had mentioned this. They have also mentioned a view from Abu Hanifah, however the mutazila among them openly state: punishment is stable with 'aql. Whereas the Qur'an informs that these two situations do not necessitate one another. It informs us that 1- “Messengers who gave good news as well as warning, that mankind, after (the coming) of the messengers, should have no plea against Allah: For Allah is Exalted in Power, Wise.” (An-Nisa 4/165) “(The messengers were sent) thus, for thy Lord would not destroy for their wrong-doing men's habitations whilst their occupants were unwarned.” (Al-Anaam 6/131) According to one of the views out of the two: they had not been destroyed for their zulm before the arrival of the rasul in this case these ayah point out two essentials a- Surely their acts and shirk was evil, zulm before hujjah b- Yet Allah will not punish them before sending an envoy. In this sense, the mentioned ayah is similar to the ayah in surah Qassas which guides to the two fundamentals “If (We had) not (sent thee to the Quraish),- in case a

calamity should seize them for (the deeds) that their hands have sent forth, they might say: "Our Lord! why didst Thou not send us a messenger? We should then have followed Thy Signs and been amongst those who believe!" (Al-Qassas 28/47) This guides us to the following: In reality the actions they have done with their own hands is sufficient evidence for destruction. Now if these acts hadn't been bad/evil there would be no need for calamity. Whereas, the conditions of destruction hadn't been met, they had been abstained from being subjected. This is because an envoy had not arrived to them yet. Whenever an envoy arrives the cause will take place and the conditions are met. Now the punishment for their evil actions will take place and they will be punished in both dunya and the akhirah. 2- It guides us to the fact regarding the goodness or evil of actions. Fundamentally the reason these actions are namely bad/evil, wild and revolt is because they are acts of shirk. Likewise even before and after it was restricted it has been shirk. If anyone is to say surely evil, badness, and sins had attained this specification before they had been restricted. This statement and the following statement are on the same level: shirk had become shirk after it was restricted. It was not shirk before it was restricted...His (awj) rejection of the evil of shirk in uluhiyyah is like this. Likewise His rejection of ibadaah made to others besides Him, the establishment of hujjah of 'aql regarding it, being an act of baatil are all among this group. If these acts had gained evil with evidence of sharee'ah, in this case the mentioned evidence and matters would have no meaning. Furthermore if the goodness or badness of the mentioned acts is invalidated, it would have been permissible to state that Allah's command -by 'aql- of shirk and performance of ibadaah to another and state the evil in these are known with distinct restriction. SubhanAllah! If it would be like this, what benefit would be left of the statements and hujjah which guide us to the evil in 'aql and fitrah while they (the acts of shirk) are the most evil of badness and the most zulm of zulm. If there is no information regarding the evil of shirk on its own in this case what else can be sahih in 'aql? Whereas the information regarding its evilness is clear and also it is known by 'aql out of necessity. Moreover the prophets and their nations have always warned for the evil in 'aql and fitrah. Likewise for those who are interested the Qur'an is filled with examples (regarding shirk and evil being baatil) as such. For example: "He does propound to you a similitude from your own (experience): do ye have partners among those whom your right hands possess, to share as equals in the wealth We have bestowed on you? Do ye fear them as ye fear each other? Thus do we explain the Signs in detail to a people that understand." (Ar-Room 30/28) With the existing concept of evil in 'aql, Allah provides evidence to them: one possessing a slave from among them and that slave being associates with his owner. Now if from among you the one who owns a slave and sees it bad for the slave to be associates with him and does not agree to it; than how is it that the slaves of Allah associate partners to Allah and perform ibadaah to it like they do to Allah? This shows that the evil of ibadaah to any other but Allah is stabilised in 'aql and fitrah. The nabawi hujjah reminds of this evil which is present in the minds and directs them to their 'aql. This following ayah is like this as well: "Allah puts forth a Parable a man belonging to many partners at variance with each other, and a man belonging entirely to one master: are those two equal in comparison? Praise be to Allah! but most of them have no knowledge." (Az-Zumar 39/29) As the minds ('aql) will understand from the difference between the two matters for the evil of shirk Allah provides the following evidence: the situation of the slave who belonged to many difficult and unskilled people and the situation of the slave who is treated well by his single owner. Now would it be correct to think of the state of these two slaves to be equal? Similarly would the status of the mushrik and the muwahhid who made Allah the only deity in ubudiyyah be the same? It is not

possible they be equal.” (Madariju’s-Salihin 1/246-256)

Regarding the same matter Ibn Qayyim stated: “If (We had) not (sent thee to the Quraish),- in case a calamity should seize them for (the deeds) that their hands have sent forth, they might say: "Our Lord! why didst Thou not send us a messenger? We should then have followed Thy Signs and been amongst those who believe!"” (Al-Qasas 28/47) Here Rabb taa’la informs us of the following: the actions they had performed with their own hands before hujjah, is sufficient proof for their punishment. However if Allah (awj) was to give them the punishment they deserve, their defence would have begun with the declaration that an envoy had not been sent and a book had not been revealed. Allah had sent envoys and revealed books to put up a barrier for their probable assertion so that they would not have proof in the presence of Allah. This openly shows that their actions before the arrival of hujjah had been evil because they had deserved destruction with these actions. However Allah (awj) only punishes after the envoys are sent and this is the last to say regarding this matter.”

In page 11 he states: “In the ayah it is said: “If there were, in the heavens and the earth, other gods besides Allah, there would have been confusion in both! but glory to Allah, the Lord of the Throne: (High is He) above what they attribute to Him!” (Al-Anbiya 21/22) Meaning if in the heavens and on earth there had been any other deity worshiped besides Allah, these places would have been in complete disarray and corruption would have occurred. The matter which attracts attention here is the fact that, Allah does not say ‘the Rabb’ but rather says ‘the ilah’. Ilah (deity) means the worshiped. This shows that Allah will not allow ibadaah (worship) to any other but Him and that by reason (‘aql) this is impossible. If there had been any other deity but Allah on earth and in the heavens there would have been corruption. In reality the evil in ibadaah to any other but Allah exists in ‘aql and fitrah. Although there is no clear information arrived from the Nabi, in reality ‘aql explicitly guides us to the following: This absolutely is the most evil of badness. Moreover this is a matter which is impossible to be permissible by Allah. Surely the betterment of the universe is due to Allah being the only mabud (deity). The corruption and destruction is due to worshipping other deities along worshipping Allah. According to this it is impossible that Allah make lawful of anything that will lead to the destruction and corruption of the universe. On the contrary Allah is munazzah (distant) from all this.”

On page 12 he continues: “It is stated in the ayah: "Did ye then think that We had created you in jest, and that ye would not be brought back to Us (for account)?" (Al-Mumenoon 23/115) From a mistaken expectation with this, He has cleansed and distanced Him self. He (awj) is greater than such thing. This situation is not appropriate for Him due to its evil, in invalidating His hikmah, mulk and uluhiyyah. Don’t you see how the matter of shahadah in His deen, sharee’ah, reward and punishment appears in the mind (‘aql). This shows that qiyamah is proven by ‘aql. Likewise it shows its evidence through hearing as well. And His deen, commandments and that which His envoys have brought are stabilised concisely in ‘aql. Later on when they are taught with wahy, ‘aql along with wahy will reach an accord on tawhid, sharee’ah reward and punishment. He (subhanehu), has invited His slaves by the means of His envoys to the goodness and attestation He placed in the ‘aql, here wahy came to explain these, as a declaration and proclamation; likewise as a reminder of what had been placed in fitrah and ‘aql.”

On page 39 he states: "The absolute statement regarding this matter is this: Absolutely the reason of punishment exists before hujjah. However the existence of the reason of punishment does not necessitate that it comes to existence. The reason for this is because for this to occur, Allah had laid down a condition that an envoy been sent and that punishment is invalid until hujjah. This would be because the condition is not met; not because the reason and necessities aren't present. The last thing to be said regarding these matters is this." (Miftah'u Dar is Saada, 2/7-39)

1- Surely the Hukm of Shirk and the Attribute of Shirk (Mushrik) is Established Prior to Risalah, 'Ilm and Bayan

We can develop the following from the ayah of misak, the hukm which are incumbent on it and the actions of good or bad before risalah: Surely the hukm of shirk and the attribute of shirk (mushrik), is established prior to risalah, 'ilm and bayan. The evidence regarding this is 'aql, the ayah of misak, the ayah regarding being which guide to unity and the fitrah Allah (awj) had created his slaves upon.

Surely the shirk prior to risalah had been condemned, criticised and the individual had performed deficiency. In reality they are standing by danger and on the edge of a cliff of fire. Because shirk is great zulm and the reason of punishment; whereas this has been dedicated to a different condition. That condition is the nabawi hujjah. And this is the fadl and blessing of Allah to his slaves.

Without doubt mankind before the arrival of the message and hujjah are excused in some hukm. However they are not excused in other hukm. They will not see punishment on earth nor in the akhirah prior to the nabawi hujjah. At this point they are excused and this is the fadl and blessing of Allah.

They are not excused in their involvement in shirk and the hukm built upon this. For example they will not be buried in the cemeteries of the Muslim. Their funeral prayer will not be performed. No one will stand by their burial and forgiveness can not be asked for them. What they slaughter will not be eaten, their woman will not be taken in marriage and most importantly they will not enter jannah. This is the greatest hukm recorded.

Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "It will be absolutely beneficial to remind the public. Surely some will listen, remember and benefit from this. And to some hujjah will be established and for this reason they will deserve punishment. Therefore this will serve as a lesson to others. In this state another benefit will occur other than reminding because by reminding hujjah will be established. Also it will be permissible to punish with jihaad etc. This way by reminding a benefit will occur. Surely there has been essential benefit each time RasulAllah (saw) had reminded the mushrik, even if this benefited only the Mu'min; the Mu'min who accepted it and honoured it. They made jihaad with the mushrik which hujjah had been established to." (Fatawa, 16/162)

Jihaad with the mushrik is only possible after hujjah had been established. However they had been mushrik even before this hujjah. Likewise He states "Surely when he (the Rasul) reminded hujjah is established upon everyone. Similarly the hujjah will be established to the miserable that avoids his

reminder and thus will deserve punishment in dunya and in akhirah.” (Fatawa, 16/169)

(The message being brought to the agenda is sufficient for it to be established.) “The kufr after the establishment of hujjah necessitates punishment.” (Fatawa, 16/254)

Ibn Qayyim (ra) stated the following: “It is waajib to believe that whoever belongs to a religion other than Islam is kafir. Allah (awj) will not punish anyone before He sent the hujjah with His Rasul. This is general. Clarifying the hukm of individuals is the right of Allah (swt). When it comes to worldly hukm, the hukm will be given according to the appearance (zahr). Children of the kuffar and those mentally sick, from the kuffar are kafir according to the hukm of this life. Their hukm is the same as those who had their walayah.” (Tariqu’l-Hijratayn)

These are evidences that prove kufr had been established prior to hujjah. However these do not necessitate punishment prior to hujjah.

In another place Ibn Taymiyyah states: “Other than those who make their deen and ibadaah particular to Allah, and those who make dua solely to Allah, no one will be saved from the punishment of Allah. The one who does not perform shirk but also does not perform ibadaah to Him is someone distant from worshipping Him and any other. This is like the pharaoh and his likes. Someone like this is in a situation worse than the mushrik. Whereas all he needs to do is worship only Allah. Essentially this is waajib upon everyone and most certainly will not be invalid for anyone. This is general Islam which Allah accepts no other deen. However Allah will not punish anyone without sending an envoy. Allah will not punish anyone as such, but no one other than the Muslim, Mu’min will enter jannah. Likewise no mushrik and no individual who is arrogant enough (mustakbir) not to perform ibadaah will enter it. Whoever the dawah had not reached in this world will be tested in the akhirah. Likewise only those subjected to the shaytan will enter jahannam. In this sense whoever has not sinned will not enter jahannam. Besides, Allah will not punish anyone with jahannam before sending an envoy. And to whomever the dawah of the rasul had not reached for instance a child, insane and an individual who died in an era of fatrah, they will be tested in the akhirah. Likewise the narrations inform us of these.” (Fatawa 14/477)

As understood from this narration even if the mushrik is ignorant and even if the message had not reached him they still cannot enter jannah. The reason for this is because only will the Muslim Mu’min enter jannah. Since Islam is genuine to Allah the mushrik are those who do not make their deen genuine to Allah. These hukm are general for the entire human race. No people have an exception from this. It is because misak has been taken from all of them. Now whoever it is and whatever deen, envoy and book they attribute themselves to, if they have fallen into shirk with ignorance and ta’weel, surely the hukm are still valid upon them; even if these people are from the ummah of Muhammad (saw) or from the ahl kitab.

Ibn Taymiyyah stated: “time will come when some nass will seem difficult to understand and they will not understand. In reality these matters difficult to understand are attributed to them (with their lack of understanding) because they are unable to comprehend the meaning of these evidences. Whereas it is

not possible that in the Qur'an there is anything which opposes the open mind and senses. Nevertheless there is bayan of its meaning in the Qur'an. Surely Allah (awj) had made the Qur'an cure for what is in the bosoms and a bayan for the people. For this reason it is not possible for the opposite to happen. On the other hand, sometimes in some places and in some eras the product of risalah had been left hidden. Such that they will not know what the Rasul had brought. This could be, by not knowing the statements or by knowing the statements but not comprehending it. In this situation because of the lack of the light of nubuwwa they will become a part of jahiliyyah. Here, in this environment, shirk will occur and deen will be bits and pieces. For instance, like the fitna which makes girding swords. Now fitna is divided into two sections: kawl (statement) and amal (action). This is due to jahiliyyah which originates from the light of nubuwwa being left hidden. Malik b. Anas stated: When 'ilm diminishes useless things like foam will appear. When the nass diminish hawa and desires will dominate. For this reason fitnah has been compared to a night of darkness. In his hutbah Ahmad said: Alhamdulillah He has left masters of 'ilm in every era of fatrah. The hidayah given to the people on earth surely is from the glory of nubuwwah. It is stated in the ayah: "...but if, as is sure, there comes to you Guidance from Me, whosoever follows My Guidance, will not lose his way, nor fall into misery." (Ta-Ha 20/123) Those who are subjected to their prophets are those in hidayah and deliverance. They are always the Muslim Mu'min. The ahl of punishment and heresy are those who oppose the Rasul and deny them. Those left are those which the nabawi hujjah had not reached the ahl jahiliyyah which are the ones in heresy and ignorance. An addition they have fallen in shar and shirk. However Allah states: "...nor would We visit with Our Wrath until We had sent an messenger (to give warning). (Al-Isra 17/15) "Messengers who gave good news as well as warning, that mankind, after (the coming) of the messengers, should have no plea against Allah: For Allah is Exalted in Power, Wise." (An-Nisa 4/165) "Nor was thy Lord the one to destroy a population until He had sent to its centre a messenger, rehearsing to them Our Signs; nor are We going to destroy a population except when its members practise iniquity." (Al-Qassas 28/59) Allah will not destruct and punish these people before sending an envoy. There are many narrations regarding the individual which risalah had not reached in this dunya and according to them Allah will send an envoy to this individual on the day of judgement to the field of Arafat" (fatawa 14/307)

This is the view of Ibn Taymiyyah regarding the Ummah of Muhammad. His view of the ahl kitab is as follows:

"Nasara (Christians); we condemn them for their denial of the Rasul and fabrication of clergy due to rowdiness and the shirk they invented and we do not appreciate them at all. It is because they have fabricated all this; whereas all fabrications are heresy. However if the bid'ah doer meant haqq with his actions he will be forgiven in this case. Yet his action will be considered void. A bid'ah as such is the type which the doer is excused and not rewarded nor punished for it...The Jews; in kufr they are further than the Nasara. Although the Nasara are much extreme in ignorance and heresy these people knew haqq they abandoned it purposely and for this reason they will be held responsible for their actions and be punished. These people with their heresy have lost their reward in ijtihaad; they have been accursed on the other hand they have been banished from that which those upon hidayah deserve. Besides this when hujjah had been presented to them they will deserve punishment if they do not accept. It is because the concept of heresy is general." (Fatawa (19/190-191)

This is his statements concerning the ahl kitab. According to this the Nasara are mushrik, in reality this is a matter with no doubt. Moreover this is a matter which is necessary to have knowledge of. However the punishments are bound to the condition of hujjah being established and this has been abolished by the arrival of RasulAllah (saw).

“And if We had inflicted on them a penalty before this, they would have said: "Our Lord! If only Thou hadst sent us a messenger, we should certainly have followed Thy Signs before we were humbled and put to shame." (Taha 134) Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) stated the following regarding this ayah: “This ayah explains that, Allah (swt) will not punish the kuffar before He sent them a messenger, and also explains that they had performed the evil acts which cause to punishment however the condition for the punishment is the establishing the hujjah by risalah.” (1/16)

These statements belong to Ibn Taymiyyah and many more similar statements can be found in his books (e.g al-Jawabu's-Sahih Liman Baddala Dina'l-Masih, 1/309-310; Majmau'l-Fatawa, 12/493-496 etc.). He declares these hukm are general to all nations and does not mention any nation, place nor any certain era is exempt from this. On the contrary these are general hukm. The view of Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) is also the view of the ahl-sunnah. They accept in consensus that the way of establishing the hujjah to people is sending the messengers. (Abu Kasim al-Lalikai, Sharhu Itiqadi Ahli's-sunnah 1/196)

And certainly shirk was established even before risalah. However the doers of shirk are never Muslim because they had abrogated the risalah, misak and the fitrah they had been created upon, also they had not made their deen particular to Allah. It is stated in the ayah: “And they have been commanded no more than this: To worship Allah, offering Him sincere devotion, being true (in faith); to establish regular prayer; and to practise regular charity; and that is the Religion Right and Straight.” (Al-Bayyinah 98/5)

Fundamentally there is the mustakil hujjah in 'aql regarding wahdaniyyah of Allah (awj). Nevertheless misak had been taken from all. And the hujjah regarding this had been general. Besides, Allah had created them all upon Islam and pure tawhid. “So set thou thy face steadily and truly to the Faith: (establish) Allah's handiwork according to the pattern on which He has made mankind: no change (let there be) in the work (wrought) by Allah: that is the standard Religion: but most among mankind understand not.” (Ar-Room 30/30)

Likewise the ayah of misak did not make an exception to any people. On the contrary it came with absolute and general statements. Nevertheless in the statements of the salaf no one has been exempt either. All these show that these hukm are general.

We believe with the fadlu karam and rahma of Allah from all of which has been explained above is shirk; the attribute and the hukm (even if along with ignorance and ta'weel if the hujjah isn't established and if they are in deep ignorance) have been established. Even if the remnants of the sharee'ah hukm are lost, the traces of the right path have been erased, the glory of nubuwwa is hidden and those in this situation

with the fadlu karam of Allah until the hujjah is established and the risalah message reaches them, they will not be punished with the attribute of shirk and its hukm, it is still absolutely valid.

2- Test for the Qualified Ones on the Day of Judgment by Allah (swt) who had Not Reached the Hujjah Among the Ahl-Fatrah

Punishment for those who had not reached the hujjah will become a reality after they are tested. The proof for the test of the ahl-fatrat in the akhirah is the sahih hadith of al-Aswad ibn Sari', who reported that RasulAllah (saw) said:

"There are four (who will protest) to Allah on the Day of Resurrection: the deaf man who never heard anything, the insane man, the very old man, and the man who died during the fatrah -the interval between the time of 'Eesa (as) and the time of Muhammad (saw)-. The deaf man will say, 'O Lord, Islam came but I never heard anything.' The insane man will say, 'O Lord, Islam came but the children ran after me and threw stones at me.' The very old man will say, 'O Lord, Islam came but I did not understand anything.' The man who died during the fatrah will say, 'O Lord, no Messenger from You came to me.' He will accept their promises of obedience, and then word will be sent to them to enter the Fire. By the One in Whose hand is the soul of Muhammad, if they enter it, it will be cool and safe for them." According to another report, he said: "Whoever enters it, it will be cool and safe for him, and whoever does not enter it will be dragged to it." (Imam Ahmad; Ibn Hibban; Bayhaqi, Kitaab al-l'tiqaad; Bazzaar; Tabarani)

Ibn Qayyim (ra) discussed the situation of Ahl-Fatrah while he was listing the levels of the mukallafs in the Akhirah. He describes the general contour of 'those which the Islamic dawah has not reached and the ones who have not been able to hear the word of Allah under any condition with the ones who do not have the power of tamyeez and who is not able to think for themselves, the insane, the deaf who have not been able to hear their entire lives and the children of the mushriqoon who have died before reaching the age of tamyeez and those who do not have good will or bad will in question.'

With his own words: "14th level: This level includes the ones who have neither obedience nor disobedience, and have neither kufr nor true iman; and they are of different types. So from them are those whom the true call did not reach at all and who did not hear it being related. Also from them is the insane person who could not grasp anything requiring intellect and could not discern. Also from them is the deaf person who never heard anything. And also from them are the children of the mushriks: those who died before being able to discern anything. So the ummah has differed greatly regarding the like of this level, and they have spoken a great deal about the matter of the children of the Mushriks...As for the children of the Muslims then Imam Ahmad said: 'No one differs concerning them.' (i.e. that they will be in Paradise)." However Ibn `Abdul-Barr related from a group that they withheld with regard to them and stated that all children fall under (the ruling of Allah's) Will and Wish (Masheeah). As for the children of the Mushriks, then the people have eight sayings with regard to them." (Tariqu'l-Hijratayn)

After he listed first seven opinions of ulamaa regarding their conditions he said: "Eighthly: And it is what is most correct: That they will be tried on the open plain of the Resurrection; and that a Messenger will be sent to them there and to everyone whom the true call did not reach. Then whoever obeys the Messenger will enter Paradise, and whoever disobeys him will enter the Fire. With this (saying) all of the evidences are harmonized." (Tariqu'l-Hijratayn)

Ibn Qayyim (ra) then quoted few ahadith regarding the matter with adding "There are so many ahadith regarding this which are strengthen each other." (Tariqu'l-Hijratayn) And he quoted the ahadith from Anas ibn Malik (ra) reported by Abu Ya'la and al-Bazzar; and Abu Sa'id al-Khudri reported by al-Baghawi in 'Hadith Ibnul-Ja'd'; and Mu'adh reported by Tabarani one after another.

Shaikhu'l-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) also mentioned the test while he was talking about the children of mushriks: "So therefore when RasulAllah (saw) was asked about those who die young from the children of the Mushriks, he said: "Allah knows what deeds they would have done", meaning: Allah knows those who would have been Believers from them and those who would have been Unbelievers had they attained adulthood. Then there occurs in a hadith whose chain of narrations is passable, from Abu Hurayrah (ra) from RasulAllah (saw) that he said: "On the Day of Resurrection Allah will test them and send a messenger to them on the plain of the Resurrection. So whoever obeys him will enter Paradise and whoever disobeys him will enter the Fire." So there whatever Allah (awj) knew about them will be made manifest, and He will recompense them on this basis of what was manifested from the knowledge: which is their iman or kufr; not on the basis of (His) Knowledge alone. So this is the best that has been said concerning the children of the Mushriks, and all of the ahaadith are to be understood in the light of it." (Majmoo'ul-Fataawaa 4/246-247)

Ibn Kathir said the following in the tafsir of Isra 15: "Here there arises an issue over which the scholars in earlier and modern times have disagreed, may Allah have mercy on them. This is the issue of children who die when they are little, and their parents are disbelievers: what happens to them By the same token, what happens to the insane, the deaf, the senile and those who die during the circumstances of Fatrah, when no Message reached them Several Hadiths have been narrated on this topic, which I will quote here by the help and support of Allah." (Tafsir)

After he quoted the same hadith of Al-Aswad bin Sari' (ra) he added: "There is a similar report with a chain from Qatadah from Al-Hasan from Abu Rafi' from Abu Hurayrah (ra), but at the end it says: "Whoever enters it will find it cool and safe, and whoever does not enter it will be dragged into it." This was also recorded by Ishaq bin Rahwayh from Mu'adh bin Hisham, and by Al-Bayhaqi in Al-I'tiqad. He said: "This is a Sahih chain." It was reported by Ibn Jarir from the Hadith of Ma'mar from Hammam from Abu Hurayrah, who attributed it to the Prophet . Then Abu Hurayrah said: "Recite, if you wish: "And We never punish until We have sent a Messenger (to give warning)"." This was also narrated by Ma'mar from Abdullah bin Tawus from his father, from Abu Hurayrah, but it is Mauquf (it was not attributed directly to RasulAllah (saw).)" (Tafsir)

Ibn Qayyim (ra) said: "A distinction is made between the one who imitated his forefathers even though

he know the truth, and one who imitated his forefathers and had no way of knowing the truth. The two categories do exist, so the one who knew the truth and turned away from it is negligent and has no excuse before Allah (swt). As for the ones who were unable to ask and learn, and had no way of knowing the truth, they also fall into two categories: 1- Those who wanted guidance and sought it but were unable to find it because there was no one to guide them. They come under the same ruling as those who lived in the intervals between Prophets and those whom the call did not reach. 2- Those who did not care and did not seek the truth and it never occurred to them to follow a way other than that which they were following. The former says: O Lord, if I knew a religion that is better than that which I am following, I would follow it and leave that which I am following; but the latter is content with that which he is following, and would not prefer anything else or seek any other way. It makes no difference whether they were able to do that or not, as both of them are incapable. The former are like those who sought the true religion during the intervals between Prophets but did not find it, so they turned away from it after exhaustive efforts to find out, out of inability and ignorance; whereas the latter are like those who never sought it, rather they died in shirk. (Tariqu'l-Hijratayn, 678)

Even if he sought it he would be unable to find it, and there is a difference between the inability of the seeker and the inability of the one who does not care. Allah (awj) will judge between His slaves on the Day of Resurrection by His wisdom and justice, and He will not punish anyone but those against whom proof is established by means of the Messengers. This case is clear and definite. As for whether proof is established against a specific person, or not, this is something concerning which no one can intervene between Allah (awj) and His slaves. This comes under the rulings on reward and punishment. They will be tested on the Day of Resurrection. A Messenger will be sent to them there, and those who obey him will enter jannah and those who disobey him will enter jahannam. As for the rulings in this world, it is to be dealt with as it appears to be; the children and insane of the kuffar are kafirs according to worldly rulings, and they come under the same rulings as their guardian. This test will be take place for only the qualified ones and RasulAllah (saw) has been sent to the whole mankind. "I will not punish people until I send a messenger to them," and verses similar to it, which indicate that no one will be punished without the message reaching him. That is done by understanding that those individuals from the era prior to the Prophethood (risalah) whom the Prophet stated directly or indirectly were of the people of the fire must have received remnants of the message from previous prophets.

It is mentioned in the sahihayn that (on one occasion) RasulAllah (saw) rode past a grave and his mount reared up and almost threw him off. When he looked and saw two graves nearby, he asked his companions who were with him, "When did those two die?" They replied that it was during the period of jaahiliyyah. He then said, "Were it not that they were buried, I would have made you hear the punishment of the grave." (Buhari, Muslim)

In another hadith which we mentioned before RasulAllah (saw) said: "I asked Allah's permission to visit my mother's grave and He permitted me. Then I asked His permission to ask forgiveness for my mother, but He did not give me permission to do so." (Muslim)

A man came to the RasulAllah (saw) and asked, "Where is my father?" and he replied, "He's in the

hellfire." The man then left and RasulAllah (saw) said, "Bring the man back." When he returned RasulAllah (saw) told him, "Indeed my father and your father are in the hellfire." (Muslim)

RasulAllah (saw) had been sent to the whole mankind and everyone after Him will be responsible from His (saw) message.

Allah (awj) says:

"Proclaim (O Muhammad): 'O Mankind! I am RasulAllah to you all'." (al-A'raf 7/158)

"We have not sent you but as a messenger to all humanity, giving them glad tidings and warning them." [Saba 28]

"O humanity! The Messenger has come to you in truth from Allah. Believe in him: It is best for you. But if you reject faith, to Allah belong all things in the heavens and on Earth, and Allah is All-knowing, All-Wise." (al-Nisa 4/170)

"I have only sent you as a mercy to all the worlds." (al-Anbiya 21/107)

"Muhammad was not the father of any of you, but he was a messenger of Allah and the seal of the prophets." (al-Ahzab 33/40)

RasulAllah (saw) stated:

"I have been sent to whole mankind" (Buhari; Nasai; Darimi)

RasulAllah (saw) said: "Each Prophet was sent specifically to his own people, whereas I was sent to all humanity." (Buhari & Muslim)

"I have been sent to whole mankind (to black and red skinned)." (Shatibi, Muwafaqat; Ibn Qutayba, Tawilu Muhtalif'l-Hadith)

RasulAllah (saw) "I was favored over those who came before by five characteristics ...previous prophets used to be sent to their individual people specifically, while I was sent to the whole of humankind." (Bukhari)

"I swear by the One who holds my life in His Hands (Allah) there is none amongst the Jews and Christians who hears about me and then dies without believing in the message with which I have been sent (monotheism of Islam - believing Allah is One and we must submit ourselves to His Will on earth), except he will be of the people of the Fire (Hell)." (Muslim)

Part 2

The transition from shirk to Islam

1 The Characteristic of Modern Jahiliyyah

Allah (awj) said:

"But many do mislead (men) by their appetites unchecked by knowledge." (al-Anam 6/119)

Muhammad b Abdulwahhab said the following: "The Prophet's clear prediction that idol worship will occur in this ummah. Muslim reports from Thawban (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) said: "Allah (awj) showed me the earth, its east and west. He informed me that my ummah will spread over and own all that I saw of the earth; that I shall inherit the two treasures, the white and the red [the Byzantine and Persian empires]. [At that time] I implored my Lord not to permit my ummah to be destroyed by a general catastrophe, not to be conquered by an enemy alien to themselves who would bring low their capital city and leadership. He said: 'O Muhammad, My judgment is irreversible: I have decreed that your ummah will not be destroyed at once by a general catastrophe; that it will not be conquered by an alien enemy who will bring low its capital city and leadership, even if all the nations of the earth were to rally against it. But a group of your ummah will destroy the other groups or take them captive.'" Al Barqani related this hadith in his Sahih and added to it the following words: "Rather, what I do fear for my ummah is for it to be led by misguided leaders; so that if they fall under the sword, that sword would not be lifted until the Day of Resurrection. I fear for them that that Day will not come until a section of my ummah will have followed the unbelievers, and begun to worship idols. I fear for them that thirty false prophets will rise amongst them, all liars; for I am the last Prophet. There shall be no prophet after me. But a section of my ummah will remain victorious, unaffected by the falling away of the others, until Allah-May He be praised and glorified-has issued His commandment (for the movement of history)." This hadith was narrated by Abu Dawud in his sunnan and Ibn Majah as well. All of these extremely strange events have indeed happened just as the Prophet has predicted." (Kitabu't-Tawhid)

Author of Fathu'l-Majid states the following: "The saying "The last hour will not come before the tribes of my people attach themselves to the polytheists". In another version of the hadith "until some tribes among my ummah people attach themselves to the polytheists" This means that this/these tribe/s will attach itself and take the side of polytheists after denouncing the religion of Islam. "and numbers of my ummah will worship idols." This proves that some of this ummah will worship idols." (Fathu'l-Majid)

In a hadith which had been narrated in sahihayn RasulAllah (saw) said: "Hudhayfah (ra) said: The people used to ask RasulAllah (saw) about the good, but I used to ask him about the evil from fear that it would overtake me, so I said: O RasulAllah! We used to be in jahiliyyah (ignorance) and evil, then Allah brought this good to us, so is there any evil after this good? He said: Yes. I said: And is there any good

after that evil? He said: Yes, but it will be tainted. I asked: What will taint it? He said: A people guiding others with other than my Sunnah, you will approve of some (of their actions) and disapprove of others. I asked: Then is there any evil after that good? He said: Yes! Callers to the Gates of Hell-Fire, whoever responds to them in that will be thrown into it. I said: O RasulAllah! Describe them to us. He said: They will be from our own people and speak our language. I said: What do you order me to do if that should happen in my own lifetime? He said: Stick to the Jamaaah (united body) of the Muslims and their Imam. I said: What if they do not have a united-body nor an Imam? He said: Then keep away from all those sects even if you have to bite upon the root of a tree, until death overtakes you and you are in that state." (Bukhari and Muslim)

Shaikh ul-Islam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab (ra) states the following regarding the characteristics of modern jaahiliyyah: "So when you have come to know that that which the Mushriks of our time have called "I'tiqaad" in our times, then it is actually the Shirk about which the Qur'aan was revealed, and for which RasulAllah (saw) fought the people [so when you have come to know this], then know [also] that the Shirk of the very first ones was less serious than the Shirk of the people of our times, on account of two matters:

The first: That the first [Mushriks] did not associate partners, or call upon Angels, or the Awliyaa, or idols alongside Allah (swt) except in the times of ease. But as for times of hardship, then they would make their supplication purely and sincerely for Allah (awj) alone, just as He (swt) said, "And when harm touches you upon the sea, those that you call upon besides Him vanish from you except Him (Allah Alone). But when He brings you safely to land, you turn away (from Him). And man is ever ungrateful." (Al-Isra 17/67).

And also His saying, "Say (O Muhammad): "Tell me if Allah's Torment comes upon you, or the Hour comes upon you, would you then call upon any one other than Allâh? (Reply) if you are truthful!" Nay! To Him Alone you call, and, if He will, He would remove that (distress) for which you call upon Him, and you forget at that time whatever partners you joined with Him (in worship)!" (Al-An'am 6/40-41).

And He (swt) said, "And when some hurt touches man, he cries to his Lord (Allah Alone), turning to Him in repentance, but when He bestows a favour upon him from Himself, he forgets that for which he cried for before, and he sets up rivals to Allah, in order to mislead others from His Path. Say: "Take pleasure in your disbelief for a while: surely, you are (one) of the dwellers of the Fire!"." (Az-Zumar 39/8)

And also His saying, "And when a wave covers them like shades (i.e. like clouds or the mountains of seawater), they invoke Allâh, making their invocations for Him only. But when He brings them safe to land, there are among them those that stop in the middle, between (Belief and disbelief). But none denies Our Signs except every perfidious ungrateful." (Luqman 31/32)

So whoever understands this matter that Allah (swt) has made clear in His Book, which is that the Mushriks that RasulAllah (saw) fought, used to call upon Allah (awj) and they called upon other than Him, in times of ease. But as for times of hardship and severity [when in harm or danger], then they

would not call upon anyone but Allah alone, without any partners, and they would forget their masters, [so whoever understands this] then it will become clear to him the difference between the Shirk of the people of our times and the Shirk of the very first people. Very few people actually understand and appreciate the above] However where is the one whose heart actually understands this matter with a deep-rooted understanding? And Allah is the One from whom aid is sought.

As for the second matter: That the very first [Mushriks] used to call upon others alongside Allah (awj) who were people near to Allah, either Prophets, or Awliyaa, or Angels, or they would call upon trees, or stones, which are in obedience to Allah, and not disobedient to Him.

As for the people of our time, then they call upon others alongside, people who are the most sinful of people. And the ones who call upon them, are the very ones who narrate about their sinfulness, such as committing zinaa, or stealing, or abandoning the prayer and other such matters.

The sin of the individual which believes in the superiority of a salih man or existences such as wood or stone which do not rebel, is much lighter than the one who believes in the superiority of the one whose sin and corruption is apparent." (Shaikh ul-Islam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab; Kashf ush-Shubuhaat)

Shaikhul-Islam Muhammad Ibn Abdulwahhab explained the severity of the kufr of the contemporary mushriks and stated: "And we finish our discussion with a verse mentioned by Allah in His Book, which will clarify to you that the kufr of the mushrikeen of our time is more severe than the kufr of those whom RasulAllah (saw) fought. Allah (swt) says: "And when harm touches you upon the sea, those that you call upon besides Him vanish from you except Him (Allah Alone). But when He brings you safely to land, you turn away (from Him). And man is ever ungrateful." (al-Isra 17/67) So you have heard that Allah (the One free from all imperfections, the Most High) has mentioned that when the kuffar were in distress they would abandon their leaders and scholars and not seek help through them. Rather, they showed sincerity to Allah alone, without associating any partners and sought aid from Him alone. However when relief and ease came, they would commit shirk again. You can see that when the mushrikeen of our times, some of whom claim to be people of knowledge, possessing zuhd and striving hard, are in distress they begin to seek help from other than Allah like Maroof or Abdul Qadir Jelaani or those greater than them like, Zayd bin al-Khattab and az-Zubair or those who are greater than them like RasulAllah (saw), and help is sought from Allah. And more severe and disastrous than this is the fact that they seek help from the tawaagheet: the disbelievers and the apostates like Shamsaan, Idrees (also called al-Ashqar), Yusuf and their likes." (ad-Duraru's-Saniyya, 2/120)

In the same manner Shaykh 'Abdur-Rahmaan Ibn Hasan Aali-Shaykh says: "The former 'Arab polytheists used to outright deny and refuse "Nothing has the right to be worshipped except Allah" in word and in meaning. However, these polytheists of today accept it in word, yet deny it in meaning. So you find them easily saying this statement while at the same time they worship other than Allah with some of the various types of worship such as love, reverence, fear, hope, reliance, supplication, and other types of worship. Rather, their Shirk is even many times greater than the former 'Arab's Shirk; for if one of them (today's polytheists) falls into distress or hardship, he becomes totally devoted and sincere to

other than Allah by his supplication, firmly believing that which they call upon can give them faster relief than Allah. Conversely, the earlier polytheists used to make their Shirk during times of ease, and in times of adversity, they would sincerely call upon Allah alone for help as Allah (swt) says,

“And when they board a ship, they supplicate to Allah, sincere to Him in religion. But when He delivers them back to land, they immediately associate others with Him.” [al-A’nkaboot 29/65]

This being said, it is clear that the polytheists of current times are more ignorant about Allah and His tawhid than the former ‘Arab polytheists and those before them.

Imam Nawawi said, “Know, the concept of enjoining good and forbidding evil has been lost with the passing of time and nothing seems to remain in these times except slight traces while this is an enormously important concern. By it, the entire matter (of religion) is established and maintained. And when deviation increases, the punishment will befall both the righteous and the wicked.”

When he (Nawawi) said, “in these times,” he was referring to the fifth and sixth generations. If this is the case then, what about the tenth generation and afterwards when foreign concepts have become so deeprooted?” (Shaykh ‘Abdur-Rahmaan Ibn Hasan Aali-Shaykh; sharhu Kitabi Tawhid)

Sayyid Qutb (ra) describes the modern jaahiliyyah and exploits it very successfully: "Today individuals have attained gods which are namely “folk”, “homeland” and “nation”. These and likes (of their gods) are abstract gods and they are no different than the nations of the pagan; which put up these concrete gods of idols with their own hands. All of these are nothing other than those gods which are associated partnership to Allah in the space which He (swt) created. In the same manner sacrificed animals had been presented to the idols in the past, kids are sacrificed for these (modern) gods. Just as in the past, there were sacrificed offerings to the temples; today these sacrifices are also presented offerings in wide measurements for these (modern) gods.

Today individuals accept Allah as Rabb however they do not lend their ears to the rules and regulations of Allah, they leave sharee'ah as if they had forgotten it, and they erase it from their memory. At the same time, they accept the commands and wishes of these modern gods to be “holy/mukaddas”. Where as, the commands and wishes of these so called gods are opposite from the sharee'ah, of Allah. In fact, these gods’ commands and wishes oppose the sharee'ah of Allah (awj). If this action of the modern jahiliyyah is not shirk and is not acting like a god then how could this be deity? What is associating to Allah? What will ‘allocating a portion from children to the gods which were associated to Allah’ mean?

The classic jahiliyyah were more ethical than the contemporary jahiliyyah. The classic jahiliyyah were attaining gods other than Allah and they were allocating a portion from their kids, animals and crop and they were presenting these to them. Solely, they were doing all this to make these gods to take them closer to Allah. For this reason in their feelings Allah had a high degree. In modern jahiliyyah, other gods have been taken to the higher degree than Allah. For this reason, the modern jahiliyyah bless whatever these gods command and they completely push aside the sharee'ah of Allah.

If we freeze and limit the idol worshipping with simple idolatry, to the old idols and individuals worshipping their intercessors before Allah, we will only be cheating ourselves. This is because; only the shape of idols and the way of worshipping these idols have changed. Besides this, the acts which have the attributes of worshipping are more implicated and they have been given new names. But the nature and reality of shirk is still straight and upright although the change in its shapes and actions.

We should not forget the reality and be fooled by the shapes and actions! Allah (swt) would want modesty, magnificent and virtuous. However “nation” or “production” requires, women going out of her house, revealing her flesh, her provocation towards men (sexual), working in hotels as a client arrangers like the Geisha girls in idol worshipper Japan. Now who is the god whose commands are obeyed? Is this god Allah (awj) or is it false gods?

Allah (swt) commands his laws to be sovereign. However an individual or a portion of the nation states “No, it is humans that will determine the laws.” They are able to continue and state the laws which must be sovereign are also laws determined by humans. Now, who is the god whose commands are obeyed here? Is Allah (swt), or is it the fake gods?

These are only examples, of practices performed all over the world by individuals who are still deviated and have made these practices into tradition. The idolatry which is valid today differing from the idolatry visible by sight, the change in the shape of shirk and idolatry should not fool us. Even if it does change its shape the truth never changes.

It is only the Creator who deserves to be worshipped. The partners they associate with God can create nothing. Indeed, they themselves are created. How can they be raised to the status of deities? How come they assign to those deities a portion of themselves and their children? Power and authority are among the most essential attributes of Godhead. The One who can support His servants and protect them with His power is the One who deserves to be worshipped. All their alleged deities are powerless and without authority. How can they give them support when they cannot even help themselves? How are they to be treated as partners with God?

The one who can help His creatures and protect them is the one who deserves to be worshiped. Strength, lordship, and sovereignty are among the specialties of uluhiyyah and among the facts of ibadaah and slavery. None of their fake gods have strength nor do they own any type of sovereignty. As these so called gods can't help those who worship it, they can't even help themselves. Therefore how can it be possible they see these gods as associates to Allah regarding their children (ie sacrificing their children for the sake of these fake gods)?

Although creation and strength is evidence provided to those of the simple and primitive era the same evidence also is addressed to today's jahilliyah. The supporters of today's modern jahiliyyah have put up different idols which they use to associate partnership to Allah with those they worship, those whose commands they are tied to, themselves, their belongings and their children. So which one of these idols

can create something that is present on earth or in the sky? Which one of these idols has the strength to help them or themselves?

If the human mind can get over the barriers and lift the barriers between them and the truth, they would not accept such ridiculous ideas and will not embrace it. This passion, ambition and deviations can turn into jahiliyyah in its modern form. All of these (tools of jahilliyyah) cause individuals to associate partners which could not create anything indeed they are creatures themselves to Allah.

“Do they indeed ascribe to Him as partners things that can create nothing, but are themselves created? No aid can they give them, nor can they aid themselves!” (Al Araf 7/191-192)

The Arabic text uses the plural form that refers only to a group which includes human beings. This suggests that there are some human beings who are considered or treated as gods.

It has never been suggested that, in the pagan days, the Arabs used to have human deities whom they treated as gods or to whom they offered worship. They only gave them the position of deities in the sense that they accepted the social laws they had enacted for them and accepted their arbitration in their own quarrels, which meant that they gave them the status of Godhead.

The Qur'an refers to all this as associating partners with God. It equates it with idolatry that offers worship to statues and idols. Indeed, Islam treats both forms of paganism in the same way, just as the Qur'an considers those who accepted the laws and verdicts given to them by rabbis and priests as polytheists, associating partners with God. They definitely did not believe that those rabbis and priests were gods or deities, and they did not offer any act of worship to them. Nevertheless, all such attitudes deviated from the concept of God's openness, which is the cornerstone of divine faith. That concept takes its clearest form in the declaration that “there is no deity other than God.” This endorses what we have already stated, that the new forms of jahiliyyah as just as idolatrous as its old form.

As mentioned before, the idolatry of the mushrik Arabs was simple and primitive. In all its stages within the borders of the minds of the creatures it really was a simple understanding. For this reason the Qur'an al Karim had tried to work their minds and had attributed in simplicity that they had associated partners to Allah because they had worshiped these idols.

These simple idols of theirs with their outer look they did not have feet to carry them, hands to hold with, eyes to see with, ears to hear with. The one who provided these limbs to them were those who worshiped them. How is it that they worship those lifeless rocks which are lower in status?

When it comes to the idols of angel symbols, or ancestors or the idols they accepted as the symbol of their ancestors they sometimes accepted these were slaves created by Allah. Just as they could not be of any help to them they could not help themselves.

To us the aqidah of the mushrik Arabs, the mixing of concrete idols and abstract symbols has become

the reason they had been portrayed in the ayah this way. In the ayah sometimes the creatures behind these idols are meant and the pronoun used to describe the creatures in minds as lively beings, sometimes it directly meant the idols which are inorganic themselves, that they lacked life and movement. In reality all of this does not carry any other meaning than the open deviation according to the rules of logic and mind of the humans who are awaken and saved from this ridiculous unawareness by the Qur'an.

After providing evidence Allah (swt) forwards our Prophet (saw) to them and their weak gods to defy them. He only wants him to openly announce his pure and simple aqidah that he had befriended only Allah: "Say: Call your 'god-partners', scheme (your worst) against me, and give me no respite! For my Protector is Allah, Who revealed the Book (from time to time), and He will choose and befriend the righteous. But those ye call upon besides Him, are unable to help you, and indeed to help themselves. If thou callest them to guidance, they hear not. Thou wilt see them looking at thee, but they see not." (Al-Araf 7/195-198)

These are the messengers' words he had shouted to the faces of the jahiliyyah. Really our Prophet (saw) had said these words to them as Allah had asked and had defied the mushrik and their fake gods: "Say: Call your 'god-partners', scheme (your worst) against me, and give me no respite!"

Our Prophet had come out and defied them and their fake gods by telling them: "Without allowing to awaken and without making me wait collect all the strength you have and your gods have and scheme against me." He had uttered these words in peace believing, trusting and leaning on the supporting power he had leaned against: "For my Protector is Allah, Who revealed the Book (from time to time), and He will choose and befriend the righteous." (Al-Araf 7/196)

This way Allah (swt) had established who the prophet had leaned on. He had leaned on Allah. Allah had showed that he had revealed the book suitable to His willpower and that the Prophet needs to go to the people with the truth of the book. Alongside this He had wanted this truth to be above the emptiness of the defeatist. Also Allah had taken the duty of protecting those righteous who work for the sake of conveying the truth to the mankind, to take it (the dawah) to them and to make sure the mankind has trust in the prophet of Allah (awj).

In reality these words should be used everywhere all the time to call upon humans after the death of the Prophet (saw) to Allah.

"Without allowing to awaken and without making me wait collect all the strength you have and your gods have and scheme against me." He had uttered these words in peace believing, trusting and leaning on the supporting power he had leaned against: "For my Protector is Allah, Who revealed the Book (from time to time), and He will choose and befriend the righteous."

With no doubt those who invite on the path of Allah must isolate themselves from all sorts of support. And the same goes for seeing all sorts of support as simple and unimportant.

No matter how strong and firm they seem to be like in reality they are simple and weak.

“O men! Here is a parable set forth! listen to it! Those on whom, besides Allah, ye call, cannot create (even) a fly, if they all met together for the purpose! and if the fly should snatch away anything from them, they would have no power to release it from the fly. Feeble are those who petition and those whom they petition!” (Al Hajj 22/73)

The parable of those who take protectors other than Allah is that of the spider, who builds (to itself) a house; but truly the flimsiest of houses is the spider's house;- if they but know” (Al-Ankaboot 29/41)

Those who invite to the path of Allah will rely and lean on Allah. Therefore what are these other friends and supports? Even if they do have the strength to hurt the man of dawah how much are they worth in his eyes? Their torture to the Prophet can only happen with the help of Allah who is his friend. The reason Allah allows his other creations to hurt him is not because He is not able to protect or does not supports His friends. Allah (swt) is munazzah from such deficiency. The reason He allows others to torture is because he wants to train, cleans, get them used to and test His slaves. And the reason he gives time to His zalim slaves is so that they increase their sins and fall in a firm trap.

When the mushrik were torturing Abu Bakr when they were hitting him with the soles of shoes; when they were hitting his face and eyes, when they were striking him, when they were defacing him... After RasulAllah (saw) Abu Bakr is the most virtuous man on earth during all of this ugly and furious attack he was uttering “O Allah how patient you are..! O Allah how patient you are..! O Allah how patient you are..!” Because in his own world he knew the patience of his Lord very well. He trusted his Lord was not helpless in destroying His enemies. In the same manner he fully trusted his Lord would not leaves his friends alone. Because Abdullah b. Masud (ra) had recited from Qur’an at a meeting the mushrik had gathered at the courtyard of Kaba he had been beaten by the mushrik so bad that he was not able to walk straight. But regardless of this torture he had been put through he had said: “Wallahi they had never been belittled in my sight before that day.” He knew that the mushrik with this action had rebelled against Allah. He knew that those who had rebelled Allah would most definitely be defeated and will be simplified in front of Allah. For this reason they had to be belittled in the sight of the friends of Allah.

Abdullah b. Ma’zun (ra) had left the protection of Utba b. Rabia because he could not stand being protected by a mushrik while his brothers were being tortured. After he had left being protected by Utba b. Rabia the mushrik had tortured him until they took out his eye. Utba had called him into his protection once again but Abdullah had said: “With no doubt I am under the protection of that who is greater than you” Utba said: “O ye the son of my sibling when you were in my protection you had not been stroked in the eye” and he answered: “No, by Allah I will not run from giving the other one up for Allah too.” Abdullah knew it was much honourable to enter the protection of Allah. Also he trusted Allah would not leave him alone. If Allah had allowed him to get through this suffering it was for his slaves to reach broad horizons spiritually. “No by Allah I will not abstain from loosing my other eye from Allah.”

Within the directive atmosphere of Allah all of these are a few examples of the gold generation who had been educated and shaped by the Qur'an with RasulAllah.

"Call your 'god-partners', scheme (your worst) against me, and give me no respite! For my Protector is Allah, Who revealed the Book (from time to time), and He will choose and befriend the righteous."

After tolerating the torture by the mushrik what happened to those who showed their bond to Allah; who revealed the book and befriends the good, in such manner?

Well the incidents of history occurred. The friends of Allah rejoined victory, excellence and sovereignty. Defeat, simplicity and devastation were left as the portion of the delirious that killed the good servants of Allah. And those, whose hearts Allah had opened to Islam, with unshaken trust in Allah, without showing any weakness and with determination on the path of Allah had set to follow in every way those leaders who had tolerated all the torture.

Those who call to the path of Allah will never be able to attain victory nor achieve any goal without such determination, without such trust wherever or whenever.

"For my Protector is Allah, Who revealed the Book (from time to time), and He will choose and befriend the righteous."

Our Prophet (saw) had been ordered to defy the mushrik. And he defied them. He had been ordered to explain the weakness of their gods and the absurdity of their actions of shirk. And he performed his duty.

"But those ye call upon besides Him, are unable to help you, and indeed to help themselves. If thou callest them to guidance, they hear not. Thou wilt see them looking at thee, but they see not." (Al-Araf 7/197-198)

Hence these types of applications were suitable to the simple idolatries of the classic Arab jahiliyyah, the same applications will be suitable to all the fake gods of today's jahiliyyah.

These modern mushrik befriends those from the environment of the owners of world sovereignty and calls upon them for help. Only little do they know that those friends who they call upon do not have the power to help themselves let alone help others. Because within the time span of the faith Allah has for His slaves, it will take place as He wishes and their power will not be enough for anything.

Since the primitive gods of the Arabs could not hear, and their eyes made of beads or valuable stones could not look and see... therefore today's modern gods; the motherland, the nation, production, machine and historical determinism can not see, nor hear... All the fake gods of the modern jahiliyyah are the same. And those gods they attain from the hearing and seeing humans can not really hear or see

either. The status of those chosen beings which the attributes of god-ness are fitted and with their commands the laws and regulations are determined by is not different either. Regarding them Allah (swt) said: "Many are the Jinns and men we have made for Hell: They have hearts wherewith they understand not, eyes wherewith they see not, and ears wherewith they hear not. They are like cattle, - nay more misguided: for they are heedless (of warning)." (Al-Araf 7/179) (Sayyid Qutb; compiled from In the shade of the Qur'an, Al-Araf, 190-195)

After all, we find to add the ending part of the hadith, very beneficiary to read: "There shall be no prophet after me. But a section of my ummah will remain victorious, unaffected by the falling away of the others, until Allah (swt) has issued His commandment for the movement of history..." (Fathu'l-Majid)

2 Evidence from the Qur'an regarding the understanding of the Basis of Islam (Asluddeen)

a-The necessity of cleansing from shirk to be Muslim

First ayah:

In the surah at-Tawba Allah (awj) states: "...But if they repent, and establish regular prayers and practise regular charity, then open the way for them: for Allah is Oft-forgiving, Most Merciful." (at-Tawba 9/5)

Qurtubi states: "...if they repent" Meaning if they repent from shirk "and establish regular prayers and practise regular charity, then open the way for them". In this ayah one matter attracts attention. That is the fact that Allah (awj) had constraint qatl (killing/murder) with shirk. And continues with: "...if they repent" now if qatl is due to shirk, then with the disappearance of it (shirk) it (qatl) will disappear. The invalidation of qatl will necessitate a pure repent; as well as without involving it with performing salah or paying zakah. For this reason with pure repent, before the time of establishing salah and zakah comes, qatl becomes invalid. Fundamentally this is an open situation. When Allah mentions tawba (repentance) He has also mentioned two other conditions besides it. It is not possible to invalidate them. The following hadith is similar to this: "I have been ordered (by Allah) to fight against the people until they testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that Muhammad is Allah's Apostle, and offer the prayers perfectly and give the obligatory charity, so if they perform that, then they save their lives and property from me except for Islamic laws and then their reckoning (accounts) will be done by Allah." (Bukhari & Muslim) Ibn Arabi had stated 'as seen the Qur'an and sunnah had both emphasized the same point.'

Let's take a look at the statements of Imam Qurtubi "Tawba will be made for shirk. Qatl will only be possible when it terminates." Also observe the statement of Ibn Arabi: "Both ayah and hadith unite at the same meaning." According to the Qur'an the condition of killing, taking prisoner, and letting the mushrik free is to abandon shirk. As seen here, the logic behind the mentioned ayah and hadith are the same.

Imam Baghawi stated: "If they repent" meaning from shirk. ""and establish regular prayers and practise regular charity, then open the way for them" meaning let them free in their land and so they can enter Mecca."

Ibn Kathir stated: "(and capture them), executing some and keeping some as prisoners, (And besiege them, and lie in wait for them in each and every ambush), do not wait until you find them. Rather, seek and besiege them in their areas and forts, gather intelligence about them in the various roads and fairways so that what is made wide looks ever smaller to them. This way, they will have no choice, but to die or embrace Islam, But if they repent and perform the Salah, and give the Zakah, then leave their way free. Verily, Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful.) Abu Bakr As-Siddiq used this and other honourable Ayah as proof for fighting those who refrained from paying the Zakah. These Ayah allowed fighting people unless, and until, they embrace Islam and implement its rulings and obligations. Allah mentioned the most important aspects of Islam here, including what is less important. Surely, the highest elements of Islam after the Two Testimonials are the prayer, which is the right of Allah, the Exalted and Ever High, then the Zakah, which benefits the poor and needy. These are the most honourable acts that creatures perform, and this is why Allah often mentions the prayer and Zakah together. In the Two Sahihs, it is recorded that Ibn `Umar said that RasulAllah said, (I have been commanded to fight the people until they testify that there is no deity worthy of worship except Allah and that Muhammad is RasulAllah, establish the prayer and pay the Zakah.) "... and seize them, beleaguer them, and lie in wait for them in every stratagem (of war)" (at Tawba 9/5) meaning: do not be content with only your own conscience. On the contrary take them in siege in forts and shelters and watch them in their paths and conduct. Until you tighten their broadness and force them to either death or Islam. For this reason He said: "If they Repent and establish regular prayers and practise regular charity, then open the way for them". Anyway Abu Bakr Siddiq (ra) had relied on this and similar ayah when fighting those who refused to pay zakah. Likewise the haraam in fighting them was laid on certain behaviour and conditions. They are to enter Islam and to perform its necessities. Its necessitation is for this from beginning to end...For this reason most the time both salah and zakah are mentioned together. It is mentioned in sahihayn that RasulAllah (saw) stated: "I have been ordered (by Allah) to fight against the people until they testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that Muhammad is Allah's Apostle, and offer the prayers perfectly and give the obligatory charity, so if they perform a that, then they save their lives and property from me except for Islamic laws and then their reckoning (accounts) will be done by Allah." (Bukhari & Muslim) Abu Ishaq stated: "Ibn Masud (ra) stated: You had been commanded to perform salah and pay zakah. Whoever does not cleans (by paying zakah) his salah will be invalid. Abdurrahman b. Zayd b. Ashlam stated: Allah does not accept salah without zakah...May Allah bless Abu Bakr how faqih he was. Imam Abi Jafar b. Jarir at Tabari stated: According to the narration of Rabi' b. Anas RasulAllah stated: "Whoever leaves this world with ihlas and ibadaah to Him, without associating any partners to Him, Allah will be pleased with him." (Tafsir)

Tabari narrates from Anas: This is the deen of Allah the prophets brought. They had conveyed from their Rabb, before the events turned into fitna and hawa and desires increased. The evidence of this from the book of Allah is the following ayah revealed towards the end: "...but if they repent, and establish regular

prayers and practise regular charity, then open the way for them: for Allah is Oft-forgiving, Most Merciful.” (At-Tawba 9/5) Their tawba is abandoning idols, performing ibadaah to their Rabb, performing salah and paying zakah. Later in another ayah it is stated and repeated: “But (even so), if they repent, establish regular prayers, and practise regular charity,- they are your brethren in Faith” (At-Tawba 9/11). Ibn Murdawayh and in Kitabu Salah Muhammad b. Nasr al Marwazi had narrated this.” (Tafsir)

Imam Tabari stated; “If they repent” meaning if they are inclined towards ibadaah to solely Allah abandoning their state of shirk to Allah, and denial the prophecy of Muhammad by making tawhid to Allah with sincerity without taking on idols and associates also inclining towards the acceptance of Muhammad as the prophet.” (Tafsir)

The following ayah of Allah is also in the same sense: “But (even so), if they repent, establish regular prayers, and practise regular charity,- they are your brethren in Faith” (At-Tawba 9/11)

Qurtubi stated: “The ayah of Allah “if they repent and establish regular prayers” means; if they repent and establish the hukm of Islam fundamentally, by this they will be your brothers, meaning your brothers in deen. Ibn Abbas had stated with this ayah the blood of ahl Qiblah is made haraam.

Imam Baghawi stated: “If they repent” meaning from shirk “they are your brothers”. They are your brothers meaning in deen, that which is in favour of or opposition to you, is valid also for them.

This ayah is hujjah that only will the fight against the mushrik be lifted/stopped when/if they completely make tawba and perform salah and pay zakah. Fundamentally the salaf had made ittifaq that this tawba meant to embrace the hukm of Islam, and to distance from: shirk, idols, associates to Allah, taghout and everything which made ibadaah to other than Allah. Hence in the ayah it is meant: "I have been ordered (by Allah) to fight against the people until they testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that Muhammad is Allah's Apostle, and offer the prayers perfectly and give the obligatory charity, so if they perform that, then they save their lives and property from me except for Islamic laws and then their reckoning (accounts) will be done by Allah." (Bukhari & Muslim) "I have been ordered (by Allah) to fight against the people until they testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that Muhammad is Allah's Apostle, and offer the prayers perfectly and give the obligatory charity." (Bukhari & Muslim) and this hadith unite in meaning and same point.

Whereas, the ittifaq of the mufassir, regarding the tafsir of this ayah and similar hadith, is the most open evidence they carry the same meaning. This is the establishment of ending war only by ending shirk and embracing the commands of Islam. This is what RasulAllah (saw) had meant with “except for Islamic laws”. This is also supported by the following hadith: RasulAllah (saw) said: "Whoever affirms that there is no God but Allah and denies all other objects of worship, safeguards his blood, property and fate with Allah." (Buhari & Muslim)

For this reason Ibn Arabi in his book Ahkamu Qur’an stated: the Qur’an and sunnah reinforced one

another. Likewise the imam of the muhaddis Bukhari had opened the following bab in his sahih: "let them free when they repent, perform salah and pay zakah" (Bukhari) and later with his own sanad from Ibn Omar and him from RasulAllah (saw) he narrates the following hadith: "I have been ordered (by Allah) to fight against the people until they testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that Muhammad is Allah's Apostle, and offer the prayers perfectly and give the obligatory charity, so if they perform that, then they save their lives and property from me except for Islamic laws and then their reckoning (accounts) will be done by Allah." (Bukhari & Muslim)

Hafidh stated surely Bukhari had made the hadith a tafsir for the ayah because the repentance mentioned in the ayah is the return to tawhid from kufr. His (saw) following statement has become tafsir for this: "until they testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that Muhammad is Allah's Apostle". Here there is a relation between the hadith and ayah. Because the letting free in the ayah and the innocence in the hadith carry the same meaning. (Fathul Bari Kitab ul Iman 1/94-95)

We understand the following from this:

The safety of their lives and property is only attained with the utterance of the kalimati shahadah and with performing its necessities. This means abandoning the worship of any other but Allah and making tawhid in uluhiyyah of Allah. If the servant were not to express this and act with it, as he expressed the shahadatayn and is cheek by jowl with shirk, his blood and property will not be protected. However if while uttering shadatayn the servant is testifying (actualizing) the shahadah, in this case it will be assumed he knows its meaning and is living its necessities, knowing what his tongue has uttered, it will be necessary to give the hukm of Islam. After this if any violation is seen to Islam by this individual he will be given the hukm irtidad (murtad).

Imam Shawkani stated: "without acting upon its meaning, only by tongue uttering La ilaha illa Allah will not be sufficient evidence to prove the Islam of an individual. Likewise if one from among the jahiliyyah utters this but yet was to continue his inclination towards his idol, his action would not be Islam. Surely whoever utters la ilaha illa Allah and in his actions there is nothing opposing the meaning of tawhid this individual will be Muslim and as he performs the necessities of Islam mentioned in "I have been ordered (by Allah) to fight against the people" he will have safeguarded his life and property. (ad-Durr'un-Nadiyd'a fi Ihtlas'i Kalimat'it-Tawhid, 40)

"It is like the following situation: whoever utters la ilaha illa Allah and accepts the shahadah of Islam but time has not passed for him to act upon a necessity of Islam, his words of Islam to the individual who is eager to kill him, must be accepted as acted upon and he must be given the hukm Muslim. For this reason RasulAllah (saw) had said the known things Usama b. Zayd said. And whoever is to express kalimat tawhid and performs things opposing tawhid—for instance like those who believe about the dead in the known sense- this status seen in their lives is the opposite of the tawhid which their tongues uttered. Now if only expressing tawhid necessitated, being left kufr, even when the individual who uttered it lived appropriate to tawhid or opposing tawhid without making a difference, this would have been beneficial to the Jews. Even though they said: Uzayr is the son of Allah and the Nasara (Christians)

said Masih (Messiah) is the son of Allah. In the same sense it should have also been beneficial to the munafiq. Whereas they denied the deen and they were uttering with their tongues what had been absent in their hearts. This is because all three of these groups were expressing kalimat tawhid. (ad-Durr'un-Nadiyya fi Ihlas'i Kalimat'it-Tawhid, 42)

To refute those which say the uttering of kalimat shahada is enough without acting upon it the same author states: "In summary the individual mentioned, has been content with dhahir tawhid in his research, he completes the topic with this and states it is sufficient to only utter kalimat tawhid. He has done this regardless of the person uttering kalimat tawhid performing acts negating this and the acts regarding the dead which are sourced from tawhid opposing itikad. Fundamentally this thought does not necessitate trust, reliance and taking into consideration and being occupied. Likewise Allah (awj) will look at the actions and hearts not abstract uttering. If it wasn't supposed to be like this the mu'min and munafiq could not be differentiated from one another." (ad Durr'un-Nadiyya fi Ihlas'i Kalimat'it-Tawhid, 67-68)

This meaning –bithniAllah- holds a great place in the Qur'an, sunnah and the statements of the salafi saliheen. Surely abandoning all that is worshiped other than Allah, cleansing from shirk and kufr, are the conditions of letting free. Hence the safety of blood and property and the execution of the hukm of Islam rely on this. Likewise this is the real reason of war. It will be executed with its existence and will end with its absence.

Ash-shayh Abdurrahman b. Muhammad b. Kasim al Hanbali an Najd states: From Ibn 'Umar: RasulAllah said: "I have been ordered (by Allah) to fight against the people" meaning those mushrik among them. "until they testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah" meaning until they acknowledge its meaning and perform its necessities "and offer the prayers perfectly and give the obligatory charity" These are the basic two fundaments. An individuals Islam will only be mustakeem with both of these. "So if they perform that" meaning when they state la ilaha illa Allah Muhammad RasulAllah, perform salah and pay zakah "they save their lives and property from me" Now it is not permissible to fight them. Until things which will nullify their shadatayn occur. "The right of Islam is separate." This is to act upon its hukm of sharee'ah as requires.

Abu Bakr (ra) stated: If they abstain from giving me something they had been giving RasulAllah for this reason I will fight them." (al Ihkam Sharhu Usul il Ahkam, 4/440)

The second ayah is:

"And fight them on until there is no more Tumult or oppression, and there prevail justice and faith in Allah; but if they cease" (Al Baqarah 2/193)

"And fight them on until there is no more tumult or oppression, and there prevail justice and faith in Allah altogether and everywhere" (Al Anfal 8/39)

Regarding the ayah in surah Anfal Ibn Kathir states: (And fight them until there is no more Fitnah...) "So that there is no more shirk." Similar was said by Abu Al-'Aliyah, Mujahid, Al-Hasan, Qatadah, Ar-Rabi' bin

Anas, As-Suddi, Muqatil bin Hayyan and Zayd bin Aslam. Muhammad bin Ishaq said that he was informed from Az-Zuhri, from `Urwah bin Az-Zubayr and other scholars that (until there is no more Fitnah) the Fitnah mentioned here means, until no Muslim is persecuted so that he abandons his religion. Ad-Dahhak reported that Ibn `Abbas said about Allah's statement, (and the religion (worship) will all be for Allah alone.) "So that Tawhid is practiced in sincerity with Allah." Al-Hasan, Qatadah and Ibn Jurayj said, (and the religion will all be for Allah alone) "So that La ilaha illa-llah is proclaimed." Muhammad bin Ishaq also commented on this Ayah, "So that Tawhid is practiced in sincerity towards Allah, without Shirk, all the while shunning all rivals who (are being worshipped) besides Him." `Abdur-Rahman bin Zayd bin Aslam said regarding this (and the religion will all be for Allah alone) "So that there is no more Kufr (disbelief) with your religion remains." There is a Hadith collected in the Two Sahihs that testifies to this explanation. RasulAllah said, (I was commanded to fight against the people until they proclaim, 'There is no deity worthy of worship except Allah.' If and when they say it, they will preserve their blood and wealth from me, except for its right (Islamic penal code), and their reckoning is with Allah, the Exalted and Most Honored.) "I have been commanded to fight them until they say la ilaha illa Allah." (Tafsir)

Regarding the ayah in surah Baqarah Baghawi stated: "And fight them" meaning with the mushrik. "Until no fitna is left" meaning there is no shirk left. This means fight them until they become Muslim, because from an idol worshiper no other deen but Islam will be accepted. If he voids this he will be killed. "until deen becomes" meaning obedience and worship "only for Allah" meaning solely and until it all becomes to Him (awj). So that no other is worshiped but Him (awj). "If they are to end it" meaning if they are to end kufr and become Islam "there will be no more enmity" there will be no need for enmity any longer. "Except the zalim". Ibn Abbas had also said this.

Regarding the ayah in surah Anfal Baghawi says: "Fight them until there is no fitna left" meaning shirk. Rabi' has said so that the mu'min is not subjected to any fitna in deen. "Until deen is belongs only to Allah" meaning until deen belongs solely to Allah without shirk. "If they end it" meaning (end) the kufr. "Surely Allah knows what you do"

Qurtubi, in the sense of the ayah in Baqarah stated there are two issues: a- "Fight them" to those who see this ayah as an invalidator this carries the meaning this is an 'amr (command) regarding the fight against all mushrik. To those which do not see this as an invalidator this carries the following meaning: Fight with those which Allah had said "if they fight you" regarding them. The first view is more correct. This is a command for an absolute fight. It does not rely on the condition that the kuffar commence it. The evidence for this is the following ayah: "Until deen belongs only to Allah" RasulAllah (saw) stated: "I have been ordered (by Allah) to fight against the people until they testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah." As seen both the ayah and hadith show the reason for fighting to be kufr. Because it is said "until there is no fitna left" meaning kufr. The aim here is to lift the kufr. And this is very clear. Ibn Abbas, Qatada, Rebi', Suddi and others have said: the fitna here is the shirk which torments the mu'min and everything sourced from it. b- "If the end it" meaning kufr, as mentioned in the previous ayah, if they end it by becoming Muslim or accepting the jizya payment as an ahl kitab." (Tafsir)

Now after these clarifications is there any need for any other explanation? After these evidences; are there any evidences left?

Surely the Qur'an brings forth the following: Fighting will not be lifted from the mushrik until they end this, distance from it and make ibadaah purely and solely to Allah the Wahid and Qahhar; and abandon all others worshiped besides Allah.

With the expression of the salafi saliheen the ayah and hadith refers to the following: What had been meant here is not, as many which came later understood incorrectly, that even if it didn't take from shirk to tawhid, from kufr to iman in Allah, they only utter this shahadatayn. Is there any other proof better than this to end this debate?

1- The Necessity of Knowing Shirk is haraam and Evil; in order to Repent

As known, to abandon the shirk mentioned in the ayah, the evil of shirk must be acknowledged so that it is made baraa from correctly. This is a necessity to be freed.

Ibn Qayyim stated: "Deen has been mounted on the great fundament of muhabbah (affection) to Allah. Hence the qiblah has been designated upon this direction. This is the touchstone point which the creatures turn around. The only possibility of entering this is through knowledge. Surely to love something is a part of feeling something. Likewise the envoys had only been sent with knowledge and the books had been revealed upon this foundation. In the same manner ibadaah to Wahid Allah, praising Him, exalting Him can only be done with knowledge. Likewise halaal and haraam can be known this way. Furthermore the superiority of Islam over other religions can only be understood with it." (Miftah'u Dar'is Sa'ada, 1/87)

However the situation is as 'Umar b. Hattab described: "In Islam when those appear, who do not know of jahiliyyah, the purity of Islam will begin to perish one by one." This is because: when jahiliyyah and shirk are not known, likewise if it is not known the Qur'an belittles and speaks ill of it, it will be fallen into. It will be uttered, it will be called upon, it will be seen to be good and it will be attested to be the truth. Whereas it will not be known that this is the state the ahl jahiliyyah had been upon. Or it will not be comprehended that this is a similar situation or even worse. With this Islam will be scoured from them. And this way ma'ruf will become munkar and munkar will become ma'ruf. bid'ah will become sunnah and sunnah will become bid'ah. In this context individuals will be made takfir of, for their standard judgment of iman and tawhid. Likewise they will be accused as ahl bid'ah for adhering only to the Rasul (saw) and distancing from, hawa, desire and bid'ah. (Madarij'us Salihin 1/351-352)

With the will of Allah, these statements are the statements of the allama who are aware of the sharee'ah and its aim. Now, how is the individual who does not know shirk and it's evil going to make tawba? Likewise how can an individual worship (ibadaah) Allah if he does not know the frame (limitations) of ibadaah and its measurements, an individual who does not know tawhid and obedience

to Him (awj) This is just like Imam Qayyim stated: Ibadaah only to Allah can only be done with hamd, respect and 'ilm (knowledge).

We can summarize the matter of the two ayahs as follows: when the mushrik repent from shirk, abandon it and cleans from it, and when they adhere to tawhid, the death and war factor will be lifted and they will be freed.

b- The Necessity of Rejecting the Taghout, to have Iman in Allah as a Muwahhid

The third ayah: "Whoever rejects taghout and believes in Allah hath grasped the most trustworthy hand-hold, that never breaks. And Allah heareth and knoweth all things." (Al Baqarah 2/256)

Qurtubi states: Allah says "Whoever rejects taghout and believes in Allah." Here a certain condition has been given -according to Tabari taghout is the one who over steps the limit- The answer to this condition is "hath grasped the most trustworthy hand-hold, that never breaks". Mujahid stated: al Urwa said it means iman, Suddi said it means Islam, Ibn Abbas, Said b. Jubayr and Dahhaq said: it means la ilaha illa Allah. All these carry the same meaning.

From Baghawi: "Whoever rejects taghout" meaning the shaytan. And it is said: everything worshiped other than Allah is taghout. "if he believes in Allah he will have grasped urwati wuska (most trustworthy hand-hold, that never breaks) it is not possible for it to break. (Baghawi Tafsir)

"For We assuredly sent amongst every People a messenger, (with the Command), "Serve Allah, and eschew Taghout"" (An Nahl 16/36) Ibadaah to Allah will only be beneficial if everything else is abandoned. As explained in the ayah: "And most of them believe not in Allah without associating (other as partners) with Him!" (Yusuf 12/106)

Ibn Kathir stated: (Whoever disbelieves in Taghout and believes in Allah, then he has grasped the most trustworthy handhold that will never break. And Allah is All-Hearer, All-Knower) is in reference to, "Whoever shuns the rivals of Allah, the idols, and those that Shaytan calls to be worshipped besides Allah, whoever believes in Allah's Oneness, worships Him alone and testifies that there is no deity worthy of worship except Him, then (then he has grasped the most trustworthy handhold.) Therefore, this person will have acquired firmness [in the religion] and proceeded on the correct way and the straight path. Abu Al-Qasim Al-Baghawi recorded that `Umar said, "Jibt means magic, and Taghout means Shaytan. Verily, courage and cowardice are two instincts that appear in men, the courageous fights for those whom he does not know and the coward runs away from defending his own mother. Man's honour resides with his religion and his status is based upon his character, even if he was Persian or Nabatian." `Umar's statement that Taghout is Shaytan is very sound, for this meaning includes every type of evil that the ignorant people of Jahiliyyah (pre Islamic era of ignorance) fell into, such as worshipping idols, referring to them for judgment, and invoking them for victory. Allah's statement, "then he has grasped the most trustworthy handhold that will never break) means, "He will have hold of the true religion with the strongest grasp." Allah equated this adherence to the firm handhold that

never breaks because it is built solid and because its handle is firmly connected. This is why Allah said here, (then he has grasped the most trustworthy handhold that will never break.) Mujahid said, "The most trustworthy handhold is Iman (faith)." As-Suddi said that it refers to Islam. "Whoever rejects the taghout and has iman in Allah..." meaning whoever abandons the idols and those equivalent worshiped other than Allah, whoever makes tawhid of Allah, makes ibadaah solely to Allah and makes shahadah there is no other deity but Allah "then he has grasped the most trustworthy handhold that will never break." Meaning he will have done something very appropriate and with sirat-i mustaqeem will be upon the correct method. Fundamentally the most important fact about the word taghout mentioned in the hadith is that the shaytan is very strong. In this sense it is very comprehensive of the evil of the ahl jahiliyyah worshiping idols, and requesting help through tahakkum etc. (Tafsir)

Imam Tabari states: According to this the correct definition of taghout is: Those which can over step the limit against Allah, and everything else worshiped other than Allah. It does not matter if this worship is forced or done with consent, it does not matter. This mabud (worshiped thing) can even be human. It can be either shaytan, idol or anything else. According to this the explanation of the ayah is as follows: Whoever is to reject the rububiyyah of every worshiped (mabud) other than Allah and has iman in Allah, meaning if he testifies that Allah is his Rabb. Ilah and mabud, surely it will mean he will have grasped the most trustworthy handhold that will never break. In summary: He will have grasped the strongest thing with the will of being saved from the wrath and punishment of Allah. Allah sees and hears. Meaning He hears the rejection of the taghout by his iman, his uttering wahdaniyyah of Allah and abandoning all partners associated to Allah and idols. Allah is 'Alim meaning He knows the determination of ihlas in the tawhid and rububiyyah of Allah in the heart and the contents of his conscience while distancing from fake deities, idols and taghout. Also He knows all that the nafs of His creation hides. As no secret is hidden from him nothing can stay hidden from Him. For this reason on the Day of Judgment everyone will see the reply to what their tongues expressed and what their conscience sheltered. If it is khayir they will see khayir if it is shar they will see shar."

Muhammad b. Abdulwahhab stated: "Know that service to Allah is not complete except with the denunciation of al taghout. Here lies the meaning of the verse, "Whoever denies al Taghout..." (Al Baqarah 2/256) That generally, al taghout is anything served other than Allah. Rushd is the deen of Muhammad (saw), ghayy is the deen of Abu Jahl and Urwat ul Wuska is the shahadah of la ilaha illa Allah. This includes its proof and its invalidity. While invalidating the worship of all other than Allah it proves all worship is for the one with no partners the one Allah." (Kitab'u Majmuat'it-Tawhid, 15)

When we look at the ayah we see how muhkam its meaning is. Likewise how clear its way of expression is. As seen, with the ittifak of the mufassir embracing Urwat ul Wuska which means Islam is set on a condition. Qurtubi, Muhammad b. Abdulwahhab and others have said this. This condition is the rejection of the taghout and iman in only Allah. As known when the condition vanishes the matter built upon the condition vanishes also. The necessity of Islam is to reject all that is worshiped but Allah and to reject and distance/ abandon it. While Islam doesn't accept associating partners to Allah uluhiyyah must also be devoted to Him, the reason for this is iman in Allah and iman in taghout are complete opposites and it is impossible that they meet at one place. As a result it is impossible they both remain in the heart

together. The definite thing is that each of these makes a place of living in the heart and one will boot the other out. So only will iman in Allah or either (what ever type it may be) iman in taghout remain in ones heart. According to this it is impossible to say so and so is from both the group of Rahman (awj) and the group of taghout. Or to say, so and so is a muwahhid mushrik or a Muslim kafir. This is the Islam we are mukallif (obligated) to inform mankind. Likewise the sword will not be lifted until they utter and make Islam their deen. In this case even the life and properties of the individual who has doubts would not be haraam.

To this point which we have come, it is important to concentrate on the answers of the following questions:

The individual who does not distance from taking associates (to Allah), idols and worshipping the taghout, on the contrary who consents with that which makes the servants of Allah fall in fitna, with the taghout which command as they wish nullifying the hukm of Allah and Rasul, regarding the individual in this state; will he have performed kufr to the taghout or will he have had iman in the taghout?

Also will this individual have held on to the Urwat ul Wuska or will he have distanced form it?

c- To be Muslim one must actualize Tawhid of Allah in Hukm -Hukm belongs only to Allah

Forth Ayah:

“Say: "O People of the Book! Come to common terms as between us and you: That we worship none but Allah; that we associate no partners with him; that we erect not, from among ourselves, Lords and patrons other than Allah." If then they turn back, say ye: "Bear witness that we (at least) are Muslims (bowing to Allah's Will). (Al-i Imran 3/64)

Qurtubi stated: a- According to Hasan, Ibn Zayd and Suddi: the people of Najran are addressed. According to Qatada, Ibn Jurayd and others the Jews of Madinah are addressed. These are the individuals who had been objected to the ayah. They had been the ones who made their scholars, their Rabb in obedience. Also it also has been said that this ayah refers to all Jews and Christians. The letter RasulAllah sent to Heracles is as follows:

“In the name of Allah, the Compassionate and Merciful

From Muhammad, who is the servant of Allah and His Prophet to Heracles Caesar.

Peace be on him, who follows the right path.

After this, I invite you to the fold of Islam. Therefore, if you desire security, accept Islam. If you accept Islam, Allah shall reward you doubly and if you refuse to do so, the responsibility for the transgression of the entire nation, shall be yours.

O people of the Book! Leaving aside all matters of differences and disputes, agree on a thing, which is equally incontrovertible both as you and we are concerned and it is that we should not worship any one else with Him, nor regard any one else except Allah as our Sustainer.

If you deny this, you must know that we believe in Oneness of Allah, in all circumstances.” (Muslim)

b- In the ayah it is mentioned: “lest not some of us take others as their Rabb” (Al-i Imran 3/64) Meaning let’s not adhere to those who make halaal and haraam of that which Allah has made halaal of. This is similar to the following ayah: “They take their priests and their anchorites to be their lords in derogation of Allah, and (they take as their Lord) Christ the son of Mary; yet they were commanded to worship but One Allah: there is no god but He. Praise and glory to Him: (Far is He) from having the partners they associate (with Him).” (At- Tawba 9/31) The meaning of the ayah is this: They had made their scholars into their Rabb in matters of accepting the authority of their scholars in making halaal and haraam of that which Allah hadn’t.

c- “If they turn away” meaning if they turn away when you call them “say bear witness we are the Muslim” Those who are attributed with the deen of Islam, who execute the hukm and who confess the blessing and goodness of Allah upon us. Moreover without making ‘Eesa, Uzayr nor any from among the angels our Rabb. The reason is because they are creations like us and they are mahluk (creatures) like us later created. For this reason we will not accept anything made haraam by the scholars (priests, rabbis) which Allah had not made haraam, in this state we would have made them our Rabb. Ikrimah has stated the word ‘to make’ carries the meaning to make sajda. Likewise sajda, to any other but Allah had only been done prior to the era of RasulAllah (saw) this has been mentioned before. Later RasulAllah (saw) had restricted the request of Mu’adh (ra) to make sajda. (Tafsir) (More information regarding ‘the request of Mu’adh (ra) to make sajda to RasulAllah (saw)’ will be provided in the last part of this work inshaAllah).

Ibn Kathir stated: This Ayah includes the People of the Book, the Jews and Christians, and those who follow their ways. Say: "O people of the Scripture! Come to a word" `Word' - in Arabic - also means a complete sentence, as evident from this Ayah. Allah described this word as being one, that is the same between us and you), an honest and righteous word that is fair to both parties. Allah then explained this word, (that we worship none but Allah (Alone), and that we associate no partners with Him,) we worship neither a statue, cross, idol, Taghout (false gods), fire or anything else. Rather, we worship Allah Alone without partners, and this is the message of all of Allah's Messengers. Allah said, And We did not send any Messenger before you but We revealed to him (saying): "None has the right to be worshipped but I (Allah)], so worship Me (Alone and none else)." [21:25] and, And verily, We have sent among every Ummah a Messenger(proclaiming): "Worship Allah (Alone), and avoid (or keep away from) Taghout (all false deities)." [16:36]. Allah said next, ("and that none of us shall take others as lords besides Allah.") Ibn Jurayj commented, "We do not obey each other in disobedience to Allah." (Then, if they turn away, say: "Bear witness that we are Muslims.") if they abandon this fair call, then let them know that you will remain in Islam as Allah has legislated for you. We should mention that the letter the Prophet sent to

Heraclius reads, "In the Name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful. From Muhammad, RasulAllah, to Heraclius, Leader of the Romans: peace be upon those who follow the true guidance. Embrace Islam and you will acquire safety, embrace Islam and Allah will grant you a double reward. However, if you turn away from it, then you will carry the burden of the peasants, and, ("O people of the Scripture: Come to a word that is the same between us and you, that we worship none but Allah (Alone), and that we associate no partners with Him, and that none of us shall take others as lords besides Allah." Then, if they turn away, say: "Bear witness that we are Muslims.")" "For We assuredly sent amongst every People a messenger, (with the Command), "Serve Allah, and eschew Taghout"" (An Nahl 16/36) And then says: "Say: "O People of the Book! come to common terms as between us and you: That we worship none but Allah; that we associate no partners with him; that we erect not, from among ourselves, Lords and patrons other than Allah." If then they turn back, say ye: "Bear witness that we (at least) are Muslims (bowing to Allah's Will). (Al-i Imran 3/64) Ibn Jurayj states: this means lest not obey each other in matters which rebel Allah. (Let's not try to find a way to over look one another's mistakes) Ikrimah states: lest not some of us make sajda to others among us. "If they are to turn away say bear witness we are Muslim." Meaning if they are to turn away from justice and the message, make them witnesses to the sharee'ah Allah had made for you and your stance in Islam. (Tafsir)

Imam Tabari stated: "O Muhammad! Tell the ahl kitab that they are ahl of the torah and the bible. Come get close and accept 'the equal word (term)'. Meaning the equal word among us. The justified equal word is this: Let's make tawhid of Allah and not worship any other. Let's distance and abandon all other mabud but Him. Let's not associate partners to Him. Let's not make some among us our Rabb, meaning commanding that in matters which rebel Allah and as sajda made to Him let's not make sajdah to any other and carryout obedience with this. "If they are to turn away" meaning when you call them upon what I asked you if they are to turn their faces and not accept what you are calling upon, O ye Mu'min say to them "O ye who turn away from this bear witness that we are Muslim." "That we worship none but Allah; that we associate no partners with him; that we erect not, from among ourselves." Their taking Rabb among themselves is as follows: By abandoning the restrictions of Allah and following their leaders and chiefs, also following them in matters only Allah must be obeyed and abandoning the commands of Allah. Hence Allah (awj) stated: "They take their priests and their anchorites to be their lords in derogation of Allah, and (they take as their Lord) Christ the son of Mary; yet they were commanded to worship but One Allah: there is no god but He." (At Tawba 9/31) (And continues to explain with its sanad) From Ibn Jurayj, he says: "That we worship none but Allah; that we associate no partners with him; that we erect not, from among ourselves." Let's not, some from among us obey, some from among us in matters of rebelling Allah. Surely this rububiyyah is obedience in matters which are not worship to the elders and leaders of people. Even if these individuals are those who lead them in prayer. "If they do not accept say bear witness we are Muslim." Meaning if they turn their faces from the equal word you are calling them upon and make kufr you Mu'min say to them: Bear witness that we are the Muslim who has accepted the matters of tawhid of Allah, that ibadaah is done to him with sincerity -He is the only Ilah with no partners.- which you have turned away from. Meaning we have submitted ourselves (action), by heart and tongue have uttered this. (Tafsir)

Shawkani stated: "That we worship none but Allah; that we associate no partners with him; that we

erect not, from among ourselves.” this is condemning those which believed in the rububiyyah of Eesa and Uzayr. The expression in the ayah shows that those mentioned are from mankind. Likewise it is belittling those in the deen of Allah who imitate mankind, and accepts the haraam and halaal of which those people have made. The individual who acts like this will have made his Rabb of the individual which he imitates. This means “They take their priests and their anchorites to be their lords in derogation of Allah” (At Tawba 9/31) Surely this ayah continuously mentions the iman expected from the servants. Until their lives and properties are in protection and so that they could be given the hukm Islam. After this only Allah will know what they hide. The frame of this, is the following: making ibadaah solely to Allah who has no partner, to distant from making ibadaah to deities, taghout and other rabb; obeying Wahid and Kahhar Allah as servants, and to not make/take as Rabbs those among mankind in matters of inclination and complying. (Then quotes the incident of Heraclius)

When the mufassir make tafsir of this ayah their use of the hadith of Heracles is because it is the greatest evidence for the following: This is the Islam which the worldly ahkam is performed according with. This word which protects life and properties carries all its meaning. There is no contradiction between what the sharee'ah had requested from one nation “Say: "O People of the Book! come to common terms as between us and you ” and the request from another nation “I have been ordered to fight the people till they say: 'None has the right to be worshipped but Allah.” On the contrary the agreement between the ayah and hadith is very clear.

This brings forth the following: The Islam which the hukm of outer appearance have been given according to in this world –hence only Allah will know what is hidden-: the assimilation of both in word and in action of Tawhid and the abandonment of shirk. As known before the assimilation of tawhid and the abandonment of shirk, the beauty of tawhid and its nature also that shirk contains only evil must be understood.

Here it would be beneficial to answer the following questions:

If a Jew or a Christian had come to RasulAllah (saw) and had said: I will utter and assimilate to everything you have brought; I will make tawhid of Allah in ibadaah and in uluhiyyah, besides I will keep my distance from worshiping any creature. However except for ‘Eesa and Uzayr. Or if some one came to RasulAllah (saw) and said I have become Muslim and I have made iman in everything you have brought and later it is seen that this individual makes dua to other than Allah or has taken on other Rabbs which bring him halaal and haraam differing from what Allah and His Rasul had informed, what would be the hukm given to individuals as such?

Imam Baghawi answers this for us in the tafsir of the ayah 20 in Al-i Imran he says: “So if they dispute with thee, say: "I have submitted My whole self to Allah and so have those who follow me." And say to the People of the Book and to those who are unlearned: "Do ye (also) submit yourselves?"” “If they dispute with thee” meaning O Muhammad! If they dispute with you in matters regarding deen this would be because the Jews and the Christians use to say: O Muhammad we are not that which you accuse us with. Surely Judaism and Christianity are each an attribute. Where as our deen is Islam and we

adhere to it. And upon this Allah (awj) says: "say: "I have submitted My whole self to Allah" meaning my heart, my tongue and with my organs I have only submitted to Allah. And RasulAllah (saw) recited the following ayah: "If they submit surely they will reach hidayah." And upon this the ahl kitab said: We submit. To the Jews he said: Do you testify that Uzayr is not the son of Allah and that he is only the servant and Rasul of Allah? They said: We take refuge to Allah from Uzayr being a servant. He (saw) said the similar to the Christians: Do you testify that 'Eesa is not the son of Allah and that he is only the servant and Rasul of Allah? They said: from accepting that Eesa is a servant we take refuge to Allah. Upon this Allah (awj) said: "If they turn their faces surely your duty is to inform." Meaning if you inform them of risalah, taking them to hidayah is not your duty."

With the Fadl and Karam of Allah and the help of Allah we can summarize the ayah in the following manner: Surely ending shirk and embracing tawhid is the amount which the sword will not be lifted until the mushrik assimilate and utter.

"For We assuredly sent amongst every People a messenger, (with the Command), "Serve Allah, and eschew Taghout" (An Nahl 16/36) "Not a messenger did We send before thee without this inspiration sent by Us to him: that there is no god but I; therefore worship and serve Me." (Al Anbiya 21/25) With the tongue of the Rasul sent to his nation: "Worship Allah! ye have no other god but Him. Will ye not fear (Him)?" (Mu'minoon 23/32) "Be ye not arrogant against me, but come to me in submission (to the true Religion)." (An Naml 27/31) "the command is for none but Allah: He hath commanded that ye worship none but Him: that is the right religion, but most men understand not.." (Yusuf 12/40). There are many ayahs as such. These ayah mention the amount of informing the Rasul had done. That is: making tawhid of Allah and rejecting the worship of all other but Allah. Hence it has been informed that uttering this will include one in Islam that the hidden things belong to Allah, that an individual as such will not be of those who reject the prophets yet a mu'min who believes in them. This is the iman which the hukm of Islam will be given according with; to the outer appearance. This is the opposite of that which makes its owner remain in jahannam eternally. May Allah preserve us with His rahma karam and help.

This is the iman which hukm is given according to which is the same as the following hadith of RasulAllah (saw): "I have been ordered (by Allah) to fight against the people until they testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that Muhammad is Allah's Apostle, so if they perform that, then they save their lives and property from me except for Islamic laws and then their reckoning (accounts) will be done by Allah." (Muslim)

3 Evidence from Sunnah Regarding the Understanding of the Basis of Islam

a-For the Protection of Life and Properties it is an Obligation to Know the Meaning of Kalimat Shahada

First Hadith

In the sahih Muslim narrated: RasulAllah (saw) declared: "I have been directed to fight against people so

long as they do not say: There is no god but Allah, and he who professed it was granted full protection of his property and life on my behalf except for a right. His (other) affairs rest with Allah.” (Muslim)

It is reported on the authority of Abu Hurayrah (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) said: I have been commanded to fight against people so long as they do not declare that there is no god but Allah, and he who professed it was guaranteed the protection of his property and life on my behalf except for the right affairs rest with Allah.

In another version it is as follows: It is reported on the authority of Abu Hurayrah (ra) that he heard RasulAllah (saw) say: I have been commanded to fight against people, till they testify to the fact that there is no god but Allah, and believe in me (that) I am the messenger (from the Lord) and in all that I have brought. And when they do it, their blood and riches are guaranteed protection on my behalf except where it is justified by law, and their affairs rest with Allah.

It has been narrated on the authority of Abdullah b. 'Umar (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) said: I have been commanded to fight against people till they testify that there is no god but Allah, that Muhammad is RasulAllah, and they establish prayer, and pay Zakat and if they do it, their blood and property are guaranteed protection on my behalf except when justified by law, and their affairs rest with Allah.

It is narrated on the authority of Abu Malik: I heard RasulAllah (saw) say: He who professed that there is no god but Allah and made a denial of everything which the people worship beside Allah, his property and blood became inviolable, and their affairs rest with Allah.

Abu Malik narrated on the authority of his father that he heard RasulAllah (saw) say: He who held belief in the unity of Allah, and then narrated what has been stated above. (Nawawi Sharh, 1/210-212, Muslim)

These riwayat show the following: War is legal until they ‘state’. In one of the narrations it is recorded as ‘until they make shahadah’; in another ‘belief in the unity of Allah’ and in another ‘a denial of everything which the people worship beside Allah’ and in another ‘in all that I have brought’. In all these narrations –with the will of Allah- show us that it is an obligation to know the meaning of shahadatayn.

Qadi 'Iyad states “If he leaves out pronouncing the two Shahadas (shahadatayn) and does not say them even a single time in his life – he is a kafir and is killed. Even if he says with all this: ‘I accept that they are valid and believe in what they necessarily require.’” (The Foundations of Islam)

Ibn Hazm (ra) said: "The scholars of Islam said: "Who without doubt and hesitation in their hearts believe in La ilaha illallah Muhammad un Rasulullah, and repeats it with his tongue, and accepts and confirms everything that RasulAllah (saw) has brought, and states he is far from all religions except that which the Prophet Muhammad (saw) proclaimed, only then he becomes a Muslim and a mu'min. He needs nothing else in order to be a Muslim and a mu'min." (Al-Fasl 4/35)

1- Expressing/ Uttering/ Stating/ Speaking is evidence of Itikad

The meaning of qawl/remark (expression, utterance, statement) is as follows: regarding this word the author of Lisan ul Arab states the following: "It is permissible to attribute itikat and thoughts as qawl. The reason for this is because; itikat is hidden and it can only be known with statements or something else that will guide to the hidden state. However, because what has been hidden inside can not be known by any other means but by the tongue, it has been called qawl. What is present inside is its reason and qawl is its evidence.

Shamr stated: "You would say so and so made me dictate (taqwil) until I said it. Meaning he taught me and commanded I say qala. 'qawwaltani' and 'aqwaltani' you taught me what to say (allamtanee) and made me speak. And you directed me to (qawl) speak.

There is an example for this in the hadith of Said b. al Musayyab. When he was asked what he thought about Othman and Ali he said: I will say what Allah makes me say (taqwil) about them. And recited the following ayah: "And those who came after them say: Our Lord! Forgive us, and our brethren who came before us into the Faith, and leave not, in our hearts, rancour (or sense of injury) against those who have believed." (al-Hashr 59/10)

In this sense in qawl there must be an amount of 'ilm present. As understood here in the hadith of RasulAllah (saw) his statement of "I have been directed to fight against people so long as they do not say: There is no god but Allah" 'yaqulu' means until they state "La ilaha illa Allah" and comprehend it (yantiqu and y'alamu).

For the shahadah to be valid one must attain the 'ilm regarding its necessities and must have certainty (al-yaqeen) over it.

When it comes to shahadah it is stated by Ibn Side that 'the witness' is the one to announce what he knows. Abu Bakr b. al Anbari stated: (Ashadu an la ilaha illa Allah) 'I bear witness that there is no other deity but Allah deserving to be worshiped' the 'ashadu' in the statement means ('alamu) I know. Meaning, I know there is no other deity but Allah deserving to be worshiped and I declare there is no other deity but Allah deserving to be worshiped. And Ashadu anna Muhammad un RasulAllah means I know and I declare Muhammad is the Rasul of Allah. Regarding the following ayah Abu Ubaydah said "Allah bears witness that there is no god but He" (al-e-Imran 3/18) Shahida Allah (Allah bears witness) means Allah had made taqdir that there is no other deity but Allah. The essence of this is that Allah knew and declared. The witness is the scholar of declaring what he knows. Shahid (witness) made shahada in front of the judge declared it and put forth. When Al Munziri Ahmad b. Yahya was asked about this ayah he said: Wherever Allah has stated ShahidAllahu the meaning of this is alimAllahu (Allah knew). Ibn Arabi stated: the expression Allah stated in this case means Allah knew and this means Allah wrote (katabAllahu). Ibn ul Anbari stated the meaning of this ayah is Allah declared there is no other deity worthy of being worshiped but Him. (Ibn Munzur, Lisan ul Arab)

Regarding this ayah "And those whom they invoke besides Allah have no power of intercession;- only he who bears witness to the Truth, and they know (him)." (az-Zukhruf 43/86)

Qurtubi stated: "The meaning is as such: those people will not have authority of shafaah. However except for those who make shahada to haqq and have iman upon 'ilm and basira. Said b. Jubayr and others also have said this. The shahada of haqq is la ilaha illa Allah and 'they know' meaning they know the truth of their shahada.

Secondly the ayah 'except for those who knowingly make shahada to haqq' carries two meanings.

a- Surely, shahadah without 'ilm, will not benefit anyone. Imitation will not benefit anyone without 'ilm.

b- Surely in legal forms or any other form all attestations (witnessing) the individual who is the witness must have knowledge of the related matter. Likewise the statement of RasulAllah (saw) carries this meaning.

"Become witness of the things you see as clear as the sun, otherwise abandoned it" (Zaylai, Nasbu'r-Raya, IV, 82) (Tafsir)

Ibn Kathir stated: "...This is a matter of exception. That is to say the shafaa of the one who makes shahadah to haqq with foresight and 'ilm will –with only the will of Allah- be benefited." (Ibn Kathir)

Imam Tabari stated: "Some said the meaning of this is as follows: 'Easa, Uzayr and the angels those mushriks had been worshipping will not have any authority of shafaa in front of Allah. Only those who make shahada to haqq knowingly with tawhid and appropriate to what the Rasul had brought; the one who makes one of Allah, obeys Him is exempt from this. "Only those who make shahada to haqq are different." Meaning to/with ikhlas. "They know" that Allah is haqq. Likewise Easa, Uzayr and the angels. He is saying that only will Easa, Uzayr and the angels be shafaa to those who make shahada solely to haqq." (Tafsir)

Ibn Taymiyyah had stated: it is necessary that in shahadah the shahid (witness) has 'ilm, truth and bayan. Hence the aim of the shahadah of the shahid will only be produced in such manner. (Fatawa, 14/187)

He also says: (Fatawa, 14/400-411) "Abu'l Faraj had stated there are two views regarding this ayah:

1- Surely, He with the ayah "For Him (alone) is prayer in Truth: any others that they call upon besides Him." (ar-Ra'd 13/14) had meant their deities. And later had exempt Easa, Uzayr and the angels. And He said: "Except for those who make shahadah to haqq." This shahadah is the shahadah of la ilaha illa Allah. They know by heart what they make shahadah to with their tongues. This is the view of the majority and Qatada is one of amongst them.

2- What had been meant by “those they make dua to” are Easa, Uzayr and the angels they worship. They do not possess anything to make shafaa to anyone. “Except for those who make shahadah to haqq” this haqq is ikhlas. They know that Allah had created Easa, Uzayr and the angels. This is the view of a group which also included Mujahid.

Between pages 409-411 he states: This includes the one who makes shafaa and the one shafaa is made to. Only will shafaa be made to the one who knowingly makes shahadah. Although the angels, prophets and the salih individuals do not have the power of shafaa when Allah gives the permission they will make shafaa. However they will only be given permission to make shafaa to the Mu'min. Those Mu'min make shahadah with la ilaha illa Allah. They make shahadah to haqq knowingly (with 'ilm). This means shafaa will not be given/ made to those who make shahadah imitating (as inheritance from) their ancestors and elders. Likewise the following has been stated in a sahih hadith:

“Surely, the individual will be questioned in the grave: What do you have to say about this man? The Mu'min will say: He is the servant and Rasul of Allah. He brought us the message and hidayah. Those who have doubts will be groping for words and say I don't know. I used to hear the people saying something, so, I said it.” (Muslim, Bukhari)

For this reason Allah said: “Except for those who knowingly make shahadah to haqq.” As mentioned before Ibn Abbas had stated: Whoever says la ilaha illa Allah with an ikhlas of heart. All the sahih hadith regarding shafaa inform us that without doubt, shafaa is only considered for those of ahl la ilaha illa Allah.”

Qurtubi had stated: “The meaning of “I make shahadah that there is no other deity but Allah (He is one, He has no partners)” is: I am uttering and making it happen (acting). The basis of bearing witness is; the individual who is notifying is informing of that which he has witnessed with his senses. Then it has been said this is used for things the individuals have made happen even if he does not bear witness in sense wise. The reason for this is because that which is actualized knowingly (with 'ilm) is like the one who understood with senses and observation.” (al Mufhim sharhu Sahih Muslim)

In his comments to these narrations Nawawi stated: “In these we see the following: Surely the necessities of iman, is uttering the shahadatayn by believing it, and also making itikat of everything RasulAllah had brought. RasulAllah (saw) had gathered all these in his following hadith: “I had been commanded to fight until they say la ilaha illa Allah and have iman in what I have brought.”” (Nawawi sharh 1/212)

As known before the belief in kalimat shahadah the 'ilm that shows what it means comes prior to it. Fundamentally believing and conception are a part of 'ilm. How else can the servant believe in the truth (haqq) of something he is jahl (ignorant/ has no knowledge) in?

b- The Necessity of having Knowledge of the 'Ilm, Amal and Certainty (al-yaqeen) regarding the Requirements of the Shahadah to Validate the Shahadah

While explaining the meaning of shahadah the author of Fath ul Majid states: “Whoever testifies that nothing has the right to be worshipped except Allah...” The statement (La Ilaha Illa Allah) could be translated as “Nothing has the right to be worshipped except Allah,” or “There is no true deity other than Allah.” Whoever speaks it while being fully aware of its meanings and fully acting in accordance with what it requires inwardly and outwardly. The two testimonies of faith (The first: Nothing has the right to be worshipped except Allah, and the second: Muhammad (saw) is RasulAllah) must be said with knowledge, certainty, and acting in accordance with them, as Allah (swt) says, “So know that nothing has the right to be worshipped except Allah.” (Muhammad 47/19) And, “Except for those who testify to the truth while they know.” (az-Zukhruf 43/86) As for merely pronouncing it without knowing its meanings, or with no real certain conviction in it, or without acting in accordance to it – being free and innocent of committing shirk, having complete sincerity in statement of the heart and tongue, and sincerity of action of the heart and limbs – then such a mere pronouncement of words is useless containing no real benefit. This is something unanimously agreed upon. Qurtubi said in al-Mufhim ala Sahih’il-Muslim explaining the chapter in “Sahih Muslim” entitled “Merely Uttering the Two Testimonies is not Sufficient, Rather Certain Conviction of it must be in the Heart”. He said, “This chapter shows the corruption and distortion of the methodology of the extreme Murji’ah sect who say that a simple pronouncement of the words in these two testimonies is enough as far as one’s iman, or faith, is concerned. The hadith in this chapter prove the deception and falsehood of such a methodology. It is known to be corrupt by anyone who looks at the Islamic legislation as this methodology, if it were acceptable, would absolutely justify hypocrisy and judge a hypocrite as having correct and complete iman. And this is obviously wrong.” In this hadith, there is an evidence of this. It is the statement “Whoever testifies.” A testimony or bearing witness is not correct unless it is made upon sure knowledge, certain conviction, sincerity, and truthfulness. Nawawi said, “This is an incredible hadith of very significant status. It is the most comprehensive, or at least one of the most comprehensive, hadith that include the correct (Aqidah) beliefs. He (the prophet) (saw) comprised within it that which takes one out of the religion of disbelief with all its various false beliefs and completely separates one far from it. He (saw) summarized in these few words that which distinguishes a person from them all (the different factions of disbelievers).” Al-Wazeer Ibn Abu al-Muthaffar said in “al-Iftsaah” that the testimony of “Nothing has the right to be worshipped except Allah” requires that the one testifying to this be fully aware that there is surely nothing that should be worshipped in any way, instead of, or along with Allah, just as Allah (swt) says, “So know that nothing has the right to be worshipped except Allah.” (Muhammad 47/19) The word “Allah” coming after “except” indicates that this right of worship is due solely to Him; no one is worthy of this other than Allah. In conclusion, you must know that this one statement, la ilaha illaAllah– “Nothing has the right to be worshipped except Allah,” comprises complete disbelief in any false gods (taghout) that are worshipped other than Allah, and complete iman in Allah alone. Therefore, when you negate this right of worship from everyone and everything and affirm it to Allah alone, then you have rightly disbelieved in all false gods (taghout) and believed solely in Allah. (Fathu’l-Majid)

Ibn Rajab said that the word ilah –god- is he who is obeyed and not disobeyed out of respect, honor, love, fear, and hope while relying upon him, asking from him, and supplicating to him. All of this is not

deservingly given to anyone except Allah (swt). So whoever associates any of the creation in something of these matters that are specific to worship, then that is a sign of deficiency in his sincerity to the statement – La ilaha illa Allah “Nothing has the right to be worshipped except Allah.” Such a person has within him traces of worshipping the creation according to the extent of what he gives of these aspects of devotion to other than Allah. (Kalimat'ul-Ikhlās, 33-34)

Regarding this statement, al-Baqā'ei said it is the greatest denial that anything should be worshipped in truth other than the Magnificent King (Allah). Also, that this knowledge is the greatest savior from the horrors that will occur during resurrection time, it is only considered as knowledge if it benefits its speaker, and it is only considered beneficial if it is coupled with submissive obedience and acting according to its requirements. Otherwise, it is pure ignorance. Therefore, la ilaha illa Allah – “Nothing has the right to be worshipped except Allah” is an indication of the complete negation of worship to anything or anyone other than Allah, regardless of whom or what it may be. It also contains the complete affirmation of worship to Allah alone to the exclusion of anyone or anything else. This is the very “tawhid” to which the messengers called to and which the Qur'an establishes, just as Allah (swt) says about the Jinn: “Say (Muhammad), ‘It has been revealed to me that a group of the Jinn listened and said, ‘Indeed we have heard an amazing Qur'an. It guides to the right course, and we have believed in it. And we will never associate anyone with our Lord.’” (al-Jin 72/1-2) This statement is of no benefit unless the person knows exactly its meanings of negation and affirmation, and he believes in it with full conviction in his heart and acts in accordance with it. As for the person who says it without knowledge, nor firm belief, nor its required actions, the scholars' statements have already preceded in that this is pure ignorance. It then, no doubt, becomes a proof against him, not for him. (Fathu'l-Majid)

The author of Taysir ul Aziz il Hamid says: “whoever bears witness that there is no other worthy of worship but Allah” meaning whoever utters and acts upon it knowing its meaning in batin and in dhahir. Likewise the following ayah points to this also “Know, therefore, that there is no god but Allah” (Muhammad 47/19) and “only he who bears witness to the Truth, and they know (him).” (az-Zukhruf 43/86) However without knowing its meaning and acting upon what it necessitates there is ijma that the sole utterance will not be beneficial. The hadith proves this also: “he who bears witness” (az-Zukhruf 43/86) How can one make shahadah of that which he does not know? Let alone mentioning something does not make bearing witness (shahadah) to it. (Taysiru'l Aziz Hamid Sharh'u Kitabu't-Tawhid 53)

The evidence of the kitab and sunnah show us within the frame of the salaf and imams of this ummah that; surely making shahadah will only but only actualize by stating it with 'ilm and attesting to its condition regarding the state one is upon. Utterance without 'ilm, absolutely can not be called shahadah.

Ibn-ul-Qayyim al-Jawziyyah described the kalimah as follows: "A declaration upon which the heavens and the earth are established, and for which the whole of creation was created, and for which Allah (jj) sent Messengers, revealed Books, and prescribed Divine Laws. Because of it the scales and the registers were set up, as were jannah and the (fire of) jahannam. Due to it, the creation was divided into mu'min and kuffar, righteous and wicked. It is the root cause for there being creation, command, rewards and

punishments. It is the right for which the creation was created and about it and its rights will they be questioned and brought to account. Because of it there is punishment and reward, due to it the direction of prayer (qiblah) was set up, upon it rests the very foundation of the religion, and it is the right of Allah (swt) over His slaves. The declaration of Islam and the key to jannah. About it, both the earlier and later people will be questioned. Indeed, no person will stand before Allah (awj) without being asked two questions: What did you worship? And how did you respond to the Messengers? The reply to the first is by realisation of 'la ilaha illa Allah'; knowing it, affirming it, and acting by it. The reply to the second is by realisation that 'Muhammad (saw) is RasulAllah (jj)'; knowing it, complying with it and being obedient to it." (Zaad-ul-Ma'aad 1/34)

The following hadith of the Nabi (saw) shows us that, the protection of life and properties and in order to give hukm of Islam it is necessary to know what the shahadah means. "I have been commanded to fight against people, till they testify to the fact that there is no god but Allah, and believe in me (that) I am the messenger (from the Lord) and in all that I have brought." Of course until someone begins to think that the protection in this hadith relies only on utterance and not 'ilm. The third riwaya is as follows: "He who professed that there is no god but Allah and made a denial of everything which the people worship beside Allah, his property and blood became inviolable, and their affairs rest with Allah."

c- For the Protection of Life and Properties it is Necessary to Reject All that is Worshiped other than Allah

Muhammad b. Abdulwahhab (ra) stated: "In the Sahih, it is reported that RasulAllah (saw) said: "Whoever affirms that there is no God but Allah and denies all other objects of worship, safeguards his blood, property and fate with Allah." The chapters which follow are indeed an explanation of tawhid and of its witness. In them we find the greatest and most important problems clearly defined and answered...Thus, despite their great love for Allah, they were not considered Muslims. On the other hand, those who love their associates more than Allah, and those who love only the associate rather than Allah, are not Muslims at all and are condemnable afortiori. Finally, the Prophet's statement: "Whoever affirms that there is no God but Allah and denies all other objects of worship safeguards his blood, property and fate with Allah," contains one of the clearest explanations of the witness "There is no God but Allah." Allah has not made this assertion alone safeguarding to blood and property, nor this assertion with understanding of its meaning, or with the affirmation of that meaning. He did not make the safeguarding in question a consequent of the man's actual invocation of Allah alone, without associates, until the person had added to this witnessing the denial of all other objects of worship beside Allah. Should this denial ever fall in doubt, or should it ever occur to him not to make it (tawaqquf), the safeguard of his blood and property falls down. It is indeed a grave problem, singular in its seriousness and importance, which has in these texts been made absolutely clear, and its solution established without question." (kitabul-tawhid)

After all this information which destroys the doubts, and is clear and evident; is there need to say more?

The author of Fath ul Majid states: "He who profess that there is no god but Allah and made a denial of

everything which the people worship beside Allah” one should be informed that RasulAllah (saw) stipulated the inviolability of one’s property and blood in this hadith, with two things: First: Pronouncing “There is no god but Allah” with full knowledge and certainty. Second: Denying everything, which the people worship beside Allah (awj). RasulAllah (saw) stipulated not only pronouncing the statement, but also according to it. This is also indicated by the ayah: “Whoever rejects taghout and believes in Allah hath grasped the most trustworthy hand-hold that never breaks.” (Al-Baqarah 2/256)” (Fath ul Majid)

The author then continues his explanation with the comment of Muhammad b. Abdulwahhab and states: “All this shows that merely pronouncing the statement “There is no god but Allah” can not make one’s property and blood inviolable; or even pronouncing it while knowing its meaning; or even confessing this; or even while one is calling on none besides Allah; rather, one’s property and blood becomes inviolable only when added to pronouncing the statement, the denial of everything, which the people worship beside Allah. Again, if one doubts or refrains from denying everything, which is worshipped by the people beside Allah, his property and blood will not be inviolable. What a great issue! What a dear statement! What a decisive reason! Allah (swt) says: “And fight them on until there is no more tumult or oppression, and there prevail justice and faith in Allah altogether and everywhere.” (al-Anfal 8/39) Allah (awj) also states: “Then fight and slay the Pagans wherever ye find them, and seize them, beleaguer them, and lie in wait for them in every stratagem (of war); but if they repent, and establish regular prayers and practise regular charity, then open the way for them” (at-Tawbah 9/5) Thus Allah (awj) commands the Muslims to fight against the polytheist till they repent and purify their intention to Him Alone, perform the Prayer, and pay the due Zakah. However, if they insist on their denial of the truth, they must be fought and killed. It is reported on the authority of Abu Hurayrah (ra) that he heard RasulAllah (saw) say: “I have been commanded to fight against people, till they testify to the fact that there is no god but Allah and believe in me (that) I am the Messenger (from the Lord) and in all that I have brought. And when they do it, their blood and riches are guaranteed protection on my behalf except where it is justified by law, and their affairs rest with Allah.” (Muslim) Also narrated by Anas Ibn Malik (ra) RasulAllah (saw) said: “I have been ordered to fight with people till they say: ‘None has the right to be worshipped but Allah.’ And if they say so, pray like our prayers, face our Qiblah and slaughter as we slaughter, then their blood and property will be sacred to us and we will not interfere with them except legally, and their reckoning will be with Allah.” (Bukhari) These Prophetic hadiths explain and interpret the verses of surahs Al-Anfal and At-Tawbah that were mentioned earlier. Moreover, the men of knowledge agreed that whoever says: ‘There is no god but Allah,’ whereas he does not believe in it or act according to it, he should be fought till he acts according to its requirements and necessities. Abu Sulaiman Al-Khattabi said: Pertaining to RasulAllah (saw) saying: “I have been ordered to fight the people till they say: ‘None has the right to be worshipped but Allah.’” ‘The ‘people’ here means the idolaters and not the People of the Scriptures because they (the People of the Scriptures) confess that, There is no god but Allah’. Imam An-Nawawi said: “One who pronounces, ‘There is no god but Allah,’ must, in addition, believe in all that has been brought by RasulAllah (saw), as it is stated in the narration that reads; “and believe in me (that) I am the Messenger (from the Lord) and in all that I have brought.” “And their reckoning will be with Allah” ie it is only Allah (swt), who can judge the one who pronounces the Testimony, ‘There is no god but Allah’, whether he is truthful, and if so he will be admitted into jannah. However if he is munafiq he will be admitted into the fire of jahannam

with its great torments. As well as this, in this worldly life of ours, we can only judge by appearances, but the reckoning of the hearts is with Allah (swt).” (Fathu’l-Majid)

Fundamentally the hadith express the following: “So, they must be fought even if they used to utter the Testimony, 'There is no god but Allah', and were abiding by some of the duties of Islam, while neglecting others. Afterwards, this constituted a consensus among all the men of knowledge and piety.” (Fathu’l-Majid)

The details and explanations given regarding the protection of life and belongings mentioned in the hadith, the declaration regarding the kalimat shahadah, the assimilation of tawhid and the abandonment of shirk yes all of these are necessary in order for the hukm of Islam to be given and to benefit in both dunya and in the akhirah. The ulama have made ijma regarding this.

Sarih had narrated the statements of Imam Abu Sulaiman, al Hattabi and Imam Qadi Iyad. These statements are: In regards to the hadith “I have been ordered to fight the people till they say: 'None has the right to be worshipped but Allah...”

Imam Nawawi in his sharh states from Qadi Iyad and Hattabi the following: “Qadi Iyad states: The immunity of life and assets is only for those who state ‘lailaha illa Allah’ as an expression of acceptance of iman. The ones who are meant in this phrase are the idol worshippers and the ones who do not recognise Allah as one from amongst the Arab mushriks. These people are those who were invited to Islam for the first time and those who were fought against for the same reason. When it comes to those who utter the words ‘la ilaha illa Allah’ this uttering is not enough for their immunity. This is because they could be saying this while still in kufr. To appoint Allah as one is the main issue in their belief.” (Imam Nawawi, Sahih Muslim Sharh 2/156) Hattabi states: “It is obvious that here it was not the ahli kitab who were mentioned on the contrary it was the idol worshippers. This is because the ahli kitab would say ‘lailahe illa Allah’ but the sword would not come down from over their heads.” In the hadith what had been meant by “His (other) affairs rest with Allah” is that the punishment of their hidden sins belongs to Allah not what they openly do. Their punishment for outward actions must be given in this world. As understood from this hadith the outward Islam of the individual who hides his kufr will be accepted. Most of the scholars share this opinion. (Imam Nawawi, Sahih Muslim Sharh 2/156).

According to Imam Malik the tawba of the zindeeq (who hides his kufr and seems to be Muslim) will not be accepted. Imam Ahmad b Hanbal carries the same opinion. After Qadi Iyad confirmed this he explains the matter in greater detail and stated: the reason the life and properties of the individual who says la ilaha illa Allah is protected because it shows outwardly that he has believed. Those mentioned in the hadith are the Arab mushrik, idol worshipers and those who do not make tawhid of Allah. They are the individual who had been invited to Islam first and had fought against the Muslim first. However when it comes to those who had accepted tawhid before stating ‘la ilaha illa Allah’ would not be sufficient to outwardly accept them as Muslim and protect their lives and properties. The reason for this is because they had accepted this even when they were kafir. In another narration of this hadith there is an addition of RasulAllah being the envoy of Allah and performing salah and paying zakah. It is as follows: “I

have been commanded to fight against people, till they testify to the fact that there is no god but Allah, and believe in me (that) I am the messenger (from the Lord) and in all that I have brought, perform salah and pay zakah. When they make this statement their lives and properties will be saved, except for the haqq of Islam. Later their (other) affairs rest with Allah” The statement of Qadi Iyad ends here.

Imam Nawawi continues the matter as such: for the life and properties of an individual to be protected he must have faith (believe) in everything RasulAllah had brought. The reason for this is because in other narrations of the hadith such is mentioned. The narration from Abu Hurayrah is as follows: “RasulAllah (saw) say: I have been commanded to fight against people, till they testify to the fact that there is no god but Allah, and believe in me (that) I am the messenger (from the Lord) and in all that I have brought. And when they do it, their blood and riches are guaranteed protection on my behalf except where it is justified by law, and their affairs rest with Allah.” (Imam Nawawi, Sahihi Muslim Sharh 1/ 206)

It is one of the best explanations of “and made a denial of everything which the people worship beside Allah”. The explanation of this is that the one who states the kalimat shahadah but at the same time is involved in shirk; this individual will not have fulfilled the other obligation which is “and made a denial of everything which the people worship beside Allah” for this reason the protection of life and properties can not be under consideration.

This is the reality. Whoever claims tawhid does not do anything to invalidate it and accepts the hukm of Islam surely this individual will have exhibited a condition so that his life and belongings are protected. Likewise he will be given the hukm of Islam according to the dhahir. And his inner affairs will rest with Allah.

Regarding this topic Imam Sarakhsi in his Sharhu'l Siyar ul Kabir states: “From Hasan al-Basri (ra) the Prophet (saw) stated: “The pagans, I have been commanded to battle with them until they declare ‘la ilaha illa Allah’.” When they declare these words other than punishments of the sharee'ah they will have protected their lives and belongings from me. They will answer to Allah. The muallif of the book Imam Muhammad states: The Prophet (saw) battled with pagans who did not proclaim the oneness of Allah. When one uttered the words ‘la ilaha illa Allah’, this was accepted from them as an entry to Islam. As a result when a person claims he has accepted Tawhid; the opposite of pagan belief then at that point it would be accepted that he entered Islam. This is because there is no way of knowing his true beliefs. Whatever is heard from him as his belief would be accepted. However if he states something other than what he had believed in, we would accept this as proof he changed his beliefs. As a matter of fact pagans did believe in the existence of Allah. Allahu taala states: “And if thou ask them who created them, they will surely say: Allah. How then are they turned away?” (az-Zukhruf 43/87) “For when it was said unto them, There is no Allah save Allah, they were scornful” (as-Saffat 37/35) “Has he made the gods (all) into one Allah? Truly this is a wonderful thing!” (Sad 38/5) Who ever of them states “La ilaha illa Allah (There is no other God but Allah).” Then he will have stated the opposite of what he had believed in before. This will be proof for his iman. The Prophet said “I have been commanded to battle with the pagans (mushriks) until they declare ‘la ilaha illa Allah’.” The Zoroastrians, who believed there were two Gods would be in the same position. If one of them stated “La ilaha illa Allah” than this would

be sufficient proof that he has become Islam. But it is not the same for the Jews and the Christians. Their statement of “La ilaha illa Allah” would not be considered sufficient proof for them to have accepted Islam. During the time of Prophet Muhammad they did not believe he was a prophet. Due to this fact they also have to include “Muhammad un Rasulillah”. It was reported that when the Prophet Muhammad had visited his ill Jewish neighbour he had asked him to proclaim “I witness that there is no other God but Allah and I (Prophet Muhammad) am his Prophet.” The ill Jew looked at his father as if he was asking permission to proclaim. His father stated: “Answer Abu’l Kasim”. The ill Jew proclaimed what he was asked to and then died. Upon this the Prophet Muhammad (saw) stated: “Thanks to Allah who has saved one person from the fire of Hell with my help.” After all of this he turns to his companions and said: “Do the funeral duties of your brother.” Imam Muhammad stated: “There are Ahlul kitab living on the soils of Iraq who proclaim “la ilaha illa Allah, Muhammad un Rasulillah” but believe the Prophet Muhammad was the prophet of the Arabs not to the (sons of) Ban-i Isra’il (Jews). And they use Allah’s statement “It is He Who has sent amongst the Unlettered a messenger from among themselves, to rehearse to them His Signs, to sanctify them, and to instruct them in Scripture and Wisdom, - although they had been, before, in manifest error” (al-Jumua 62/2) as proof. Among them who ever carries this belief still will not be considered to have entered Islam. In order for this to happen, for them to enter Islam they have to separate from their religion completely. Even if a Jew or a Christian states they have entered Islam by saying “I am Muslim” or “I have become Muslim” this still will not be accepted. This is because they give the name Islam to their false religion. A Muslim is a person who submits himself to the Truth (al- Haqq). They state they have submitted to the truth. Therefore with their statement we do not have to believe and accept them as Muslims unless they leave their old religion and beliefs behind. Again if one of them say “I am far from Judaism” but does not proclaim his entrance to Islam, his Islam or his so called proclamation will not be accepted. He could have left Judaism and entered Christianity. However after stated “I have left Judaism” he states “I have entered Islam” then the possibility of his conversion to Christianity will be negated. Some of the scholars state that if he says he has entered Islam but does not state that he has left Judaism he still will be considered to have become Islam. Because the statement of entrance to Islam contradicts his old religion therefore it would be sufficient proof that he has actually become Islam. If a Magian says “I have become Muslim” or “I am Muslim” his entrance to Islam will be accepted. Because they don’t believe in the qualification of Islam and they even use it to curse one another. If one of their children becomes crabby they will rebuke the child by saying the word “Muslim” to it. Therefore if a Magian proclaims he has become Islam this will be accepted and will be treated as a Muslim.” (Sharhu’l Siyar ul Kabir)

Qurtubi in the tafsir of an-Nisa 94 narrated from Malik: About a kafir who states “I came to request iman” he said: These are very difficult matters. According to my view an individual as such will be taken to a place he will be under protection. A hukm will not be given in favor of his Islam because kufr had been stable about him. For this reason it is unavoidable for something which will prove his iman to come out into the open, it is not sufficient that he says I am Muslim, I am mu’min and even his performance of salah is insufficient.” (Tafsir)

Hasan stated Abu Hanifah narrated the following: “If a Christian or a Jew state I make shahdah to la ilaha illa Allah and I have left my religion, he will not be given the hukm Muslim. They do not escape from

uttering the kalimat tawhid, abandoning their mentioned religion wont be proof they had entered Islam either. It is a possibility that they have entered another religion other than Islam. However if he states the kalimat tawhid, states he has left/ abandoned Christianity or Judaism and states I have entered the deen of Muhammad (saw) in this case he will be given the hukm Islam. Because in a situation as such there is no room left for any other possibility.” (Badaius Sanai Fi Tartib Assharai 9/4311)

Again the fatawa Hafidh Ibn Hajar had given regarding the individual who states la ilaha illa Allah also gives an explanation to the matter: After narrating the following hadith “I have been commanded to battle with them until they declare ‘la ilaha illa Allah’.” When they declare these words other than punishments of the sharee'ah they will have protected their lives and belongings from me. They will answer to Allah.” He says: “This hadith shows that even if the individual only utters la ilaha illa Allah but does not add anything to it, it is prohibited to kill him. This is haqq however will one be Muslim with just uttering this word? The excepted view is ‘no he will not be Muslim’. However he will not be killed in this situation until he is tested. If he accepts the risalah of RasulAllah (saw) and adheres to the hukm of Islam he will be given the hukm of Islam. In the continuation of this hadith in the part ‘except for the haq of Islam’ shows proof for this. (The book of fath, the bab ‘the individual who does not accept the fard will be invited to tawba, if he does not repent he will be killed’)

Ibn Hajar also said: “If the kafir is an idolworshiper who does not utter the kalimah of tawhid; the hukm of Muslim will be performed when he utters the kalimah of tawhid. After this he will be asked to accept other rulings of Islam and become distant (make baraa) from all religions which contradicts with Islam. However if he is a person who although utters tawhid but rejects nubuwwah (prophethood) then he will be asked to utter (confirm) the prophethood of RasulAllah. If he is a person who believes that RasulAllah had been sent only to the Arabs as a prophet then he must confirm that RasulAllah had been sent to all mankind. If he reject any of the wajib or sees permissible any of the haraam then he must become distant (make baraa) from this itikad of his.” (Fathu’l Bari, 19/382; Naylul Awtar, 11/461)

Fahrudin ar-Razi said: “The majority of the fuqaha said: If a Jew or a Christian says ‘I am a mu'min’ or ‘I become a Muslim’ he will not be performed the hukm of being Muslim with this statement. It is because he believes Islam to be whatever he is upon and it (what he is upon) as iman. If he says: ‘La-ilaha illallah Muhammadun RasulAllah’ he will not be given the hukm of Muslim according to the some; it is because there are people among them who says ‘Muhammad had not been sent to the all mankind, but had sent to the Arabs as a Rasul of Allah’ and also there are some who say: ‘certainly Muhammad is a haqq prophet however there will be other prophets after him’. On the contrary he must confess that the religion he was upon to be baatil and the religion which is present among the Muslim is haqq. Allah knows the best.” (Tafsiru Razi, 5/344; Tafsirul Lubab li Ibn-i Adil, 5/312; Tafsiru Neysaburi, 3/57)

Al Kashmiri stated: “Just like denying the restriction (haraam) of alcohol an individual who becomes a kafir for something which is obligated to have knowledge of, this individual must renounce this itikad. He can not carry an itikad opposing the kalimat he has uttered. As long as he does not renounce his itikad, this uttering of kalimat shahadah will not benefit him. In a situation as such the utterance of the kalimat will not lift the kufr in that individual’s life. (Al Kashmiri, Ikfaru’l Mulhidin, 63)

Imam Baghawi stated: "Even if the kuffar who do not believe in the oneness of Allah and believe in two or more deities, state la ilaha illa Allah they will be given the hukm as Muslim. Then he will be forced to accept that he is distant from all deen that is not Islam and to accept all the hukm of Islam. However if he is to accept the oneness of Allah but is from among those who reject the risalah of RashulAllah (saw) his utterance of la ilaha illa Allah will not be sufficient for him to be muslim, unless he adds Muhammad un RasulAllah only then will he be given the hukm Islam. If he is from among those who believe that RasulAllah (saw) had only been sent to the Arabs stating la ilaha illa Allah Muhammad un RasulAllah will not be sufficient to give hukm of Islam to him; however if he is to add to this that Muhammad had been sent to all mankind only then will he be given the hukm Islam. If the reason for his kufr is that he has denied something that is fard or that because he has made halaal of something that is haraam, it will be insufficient that he states la ilaha illa Allah Muhammad un RasulAllah unless he renounces his corrupt views and then will he become Muslim." (Naylil Awtar 9/84)

Under the reading "A Kafir becoming Muslim" Al Mawsili informs us the following: "The principal of this is as such: If a kafir states the opposite of what he believes he will be given the hukm Muslim. If the individuals who reject tawhid from the madhabs Sanawiyya and Mani also the idol worshipers and the mushrik state 'There is no other deity but Allah' or 'I bear witness that Muhammad is the envoy of Allah' or 'I have become Muslim' or 'I have become mu'min' or 'I am from the deen Islam' or 'I am from the deen of Hanif' he will have become Muslim. If he is to believe in the oneness of Allah but like the Jewish and Christian rejects the prophethood of Muhammad (saw) he will not become Muslim by stating la ilaha illa Allah. However if he bears witness that Muhammad is the envoy of Allah he will become Muslim. A group from far believe that Muhammad had been sent as a prophet to the Arab and not the Bani Isra'il. Even if they state the kalimat shahadah they will not become Muslim unless they abandon the deen they are upon. If one among them state 'I have entered Islam' some will say he will be given the hukm Muslim because this statement will prove he has just entered Islam. This statement is opposite to his old belief and this will show he has distanced from this belief. Karhi had explained this in his work Muhtasar. If this man says 'I am Muslim' Abu Hanifah stated he will not be a Muslim unless he has distanced from his old belief. However Abu Hanifah had later on given up this idea and stated that his utterance as such will show he has become Muslim. If a kafir performs salah with jamaa'ah or recites the athan in a masjid or states I believe in the reality of performing salah in jamaa'ah he will be Muslim, because he will have done an act only peculiar to Islam. In the same sense doing something peculiar to kufr will be evidence of one being kafir. The one who makes sajda to an idol, the one who ties a zunnar and the one who wears the magus hat will be given the hukm of kafir. According to a view narrated from Imam Muhammad if a gayr Muslim (non Muslim) discretely performs salah and turns to our qiblah he will be Muslim. If he makes talbiya, gets in ihram and attends hajj with the Muslim, he will become Muslim" (Al Ihtiya li talilil Muhtar, 4/110-111)

In the chapter of murtads, Makdisi states: "Normally a Jewish who states tawhid and Muhammad is the rasul of Allah will have entered Islam. However it is not sufficient that he utters only the first part of the shahadah la ilaha illa Allah. One of the reasons the Jewish perform kufr is that they deny the prophethood of Muhammad (saw). They will not be given the hukm Muslim unless they abandon their

kufr and accept the prophethood of Muhammad (saw). They will be treated as asl kafir or the one who denies tawhid. However an individual who becomes kafir by rejecting the Prophet or Kitab or a fard, will not become Muslim by only uttering the kalimat shahadah. Likewise all the ahl bid'ah believe to be Muslim however there are kafir among them." (Al Mughni, Bab Kitabu'l Murtad)

Qadi Iyad said "For someone to say La ilaha illallah it is a sign that he has responded to iman, it is only accepted alone from the people who used to be Mushrikun (pagans) before. But those who are already saying La ilaha illallah, it is not enough for them to be protected (i.e. blood and wealth) by saying La ilaha illallah and doing other kinds of kufr." (Ash-Shifaa', 2/230-250)

There are many examples of these in the books. Hasbuna'llahu wa ni'mal-wakil. (Allah is enough for us – how excellent He is a Guardian.)

d- The kalimah tawhid will only protect the individual who utters it with the condition that he distances from shirk also in actions

Abu Batin stated: "What is meant by 'la ilaha illa Allah' is to distance from shirk and to escape from all that is worshiped but Allah. The Arab mushrik had known (understood) what had been meant by this. They were individuals of eloquence. For this reason when one among them said there is no deity other than Allah worthy of worship he would distance from shirk and distance from worshipping any other but Allah. If one of them said la ilaha illa Allah but would continue to worship other deities this word would not protect him. The reason for this is the statement in the following ayah: "And fight them on until there is no more tumult or oppression, and there prevail justice and faith in Allah altogether and everywhere." (al-Anfal 8/39) "Then fight and slay the Pagans wherever ye find them, and seize them, beleaguer them, and lie in wait for them in every stratagem (of war); but if they repent, and establish regular prayers and practise regular charity, then open the way for them." (at-Tawbah 9/5) RasulAllah (saw) stated: "I was sent in front of the Hour with the sword, until Allah is worshiped alone." (Ahmad, 2/50-92, 7/142; Abu Dawud, Libas: 403; Ibni Taymiyyah Iktidau's-sirati'l-mustaqim, 94; Ibni Hajar Fathu'l-Bari, 10/230) This is the significance of the following ayah: "And fight them on until there is no more tumult or oppression, and there prevail justice and faith in Allah altogether and everywhere." (al-Anfal 8/39) Even this means 'la ilaha illah Allah'." (Majmuat'ur-Rasail wal-Masail, 5/495)

The author of Taysir ul Aziz il Hamiyd stated: "Whoever is to perform an act of ibadaah to any other but Allah he will become mushrik even if he states la ilaha illa Allah. The reason is because he will not have acted according to and will not have fulfilled the necessities of tawhid and ikhlas." (Taysir ul Aziz il Hamiyd Sharhu Kitabu Tawhid 51)

"Fundamentally with "until Allah is worshiped alone" RasulAllah (saw) had meant that although an individual states la ilaha illa Allah, he warned and informed that he may still be a mushrik. Just like the Jewish, munafiq and the grave worshippers. However some among those who saw the Prophet invite to la ilaha illa Allah had thought he was calling to only utter the kalimah 'la ilaha illa Allah'. This is extreme ignorance. On the contrary he (saw) had invited them to utter the kalimah, to act upon it and to

abandon worship to all other but Allah. For this reason they had said "What! shall we give up our gods for the sake of a Poet possessed?" (as-Saffat 37/36) and "Has he made the gods (all) into one Allah? Truly this is a wonderful thing!" (Sad 38/5) Likewise this is why they had avoided from uttering the kalimah. If they had uttered it and they had continued to worship Lat, Uzza and Manat surely they would never be Muslim and RasulAllah (saw) would have continued to fight with them. Until they give up their associating partners to Allah, until they abandon worshipping them and until they worship only Allah. Basically this is a matter which must be known with the kitab, Sunnah and ijma." (Taysir'ul Aziz'il Hamiyd Sharhu Kitabu Tawhid, 58)

"Surely if one of the mushrik is to say 'la ilaha illa Allah' and is to express that 'Muhammad is RasulAllah' and if he performs salah, fasts, goes to hajj and only does this because he sees others doing this and subjects to them without performing any shirk but does not comprehend any of these actions, certainly no one will have doubt that this individual can not be considered Muslim. Likewise all of the maghrib fuqaha in the beginning of the 11th century (maybe even before) had given a fatawa regarding an individual as such. The Malikee scholar, the author of Ad Darr us Samyn fi sharh il Murshid il Muin had narrated this. He stated: "This matter which fatawa had been given about it is clearly an open matter. It is such that there is not even a chance that two people have ikhtilaf over it." When it is looked at from this frame there will be no doubt that the graveworshippers situation is much disgusting than this. The reason is because they carry the belief regarding many different rabb being separate deities. (Taysir ul Aziz il Hamiyd Sharhu Kitabu Tawhid, 60)

The authors' expression "certainly no one will have doubt that this individual can not be considered Muslim" carries the meaning Islam/ Muslim that will save one in the akhirah. The reason is because his distancing from shirk and outward appearance of Islam which protects his life and properties in this world and its hukm is upon Islam it originated from. This type of Islam by the fuqaha is called the hukm-i Islam (being Muslim only by hukm/outward appearance/ namely Muslim).

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) states: "However, most of the Muslim before any seen action of iman, have been given the hukm Muslim because they had been born to a Muslim mother and father. Later on when they grow up they either show actions of iman; in this means sincerely perform the actions of fard or some of them continue to perform these actions only because it has become a culture, their relatives do it and the people of the area they live in do it. For example, he will pay zakah. Hence it is a tradition, for the higher authority to collect a portion of the earnings. This individual who pays can not comprehend the genuineness or the detailed reason for the necessity of this action. Within this state of mind, to him there is not much difference between a made up tax and zakah. Or he will go up to Arafa with the people of Mecca every year because it has become a custom. Without acknowledging in summary or in details that this is an act of ibadah to Allah. Or he will fight with the kuffar because his tribe is fighting with them; he will fight because he is subjected to his tribe, etc. Here, there is doubt that the actions (ibadah) of this individual are invalid. On the contrary the Qur'an, Sunnah and the ijma of the ummah all state that these actions will not take the place of the fard. In other words with actions as such the fard will not be aborted. In the same manner the Islam of most is only a hukm of Islam (according to appearance, seen actions; not absolute and not irrevocable). This will only enter their hearts when they

have been ordered, that is if it does (enter their hearts). So, were this intention not to be obligatory upon them, they would not at all attempt to have it, and their hearts would be empty of it, and they would essentially be hypocrites, carrying out their actions out of habit and imitation, as is the case with many people.” (Fatawa, 26/30-32)

d- The kalimah tawhid will only protect the individual who utters it with the condition that he distances from shirk also in actions

Abu Batin stated: “What is meant by ‘la ilaha illa Allah’ is to distance from shirk and to escape from all that is worshiped but Allah. The Arab mushrik had known (understood) what had been meant by this. They were individuals of eloquence. For this reason when one among them said there is no deity other than Allah worthy of worship he would distance from shirk and distance from worshipping any other but Allah. If one of them said la ilaha illa Allah but would continue to worship other deities this word would not protect him. The reason for this is the statement in the following ayah: “And fight them on until there is no more tumult or oppression, and there prevail justice and faith in Allah altogether and everywhere.” (al-Anfal 8/39) “Then fight and slay the Pagans wherever ye find them, and seize them, beleaguer them, and lie in wait for them in every stratagem (of war); but if they repent, and establish regular prayers and practise regular charity, then open the way for them.” (at-Tawbah 9/5) RasulAllah (saw) stated: “I was sent in front of the Hour with the sword, until Allah is worshiped alone.” (Ahmad, 2/50-92, 7/142; Abu Dawud, Libas: 403; Ibni Taymiyyah Iktidau's-sirati'l-mustaqim, 94; Ibni Hajar Fathu'l-Bari, 10/230) This is the significance of the following ayah: “And fight them on until there is no more tumult or oppression, and there prevail justice and faith in Allah altogether and everywhere.” (al-Anfal 8/39) Even this means ‘la ilaha illah Allah’.” (Majmuat'ur-Rasail wal-Masail, 5/495)

The author of Taysir ul Aziz il Hamiyd stated: “Whoever is to perform an act of ibadaah to any other but Allah he will become mushrik even if he states la ilaha illa Allah. The reason is because he will not have acted according to and will not have fulfilled the necessities of tawhid and ikhlas.” (Taysir ul Aziz il Hamiyd Sharhu Kitabu Tawhid 51)

“Fundamentally with “until Allah is worshiped alone” RasulAllah (saw) had meant that although an individual states la ilaha illa Allah, he warned and informed that he may still be a mushrik. Just like the Jewish, munafiq and the grave worshippers. However some among those who saw the Prophet invite to la ilaha illa Allah had thought he was calling to only utter the kalimah ‘la ilaha illa Allah’. This is extreme ignorance. On the contrary he (saw) had invited them to utter the kalimah, to act upon it and to abandon worship to all other but Allah. For this reason they had said "What! shall we give up our gods for the sake of a Poet possessed?" (as-Saffat 37/36) and “Has he made the gods (all) into one Allah? Truly this is a wonderful thing!” (Sad 38/5) Likewise this is why they had avoided from uttering the kalimah. If they had uttered it and they had continued to worship Lat, Uzza and Manat surely they would never be Muslim and RasulAllah (saw) would have continued to fight with them. Until they give up their associating partners to Allah, until they abandon worshipping them and until they worship only Allah. Basically this is a matter which must be known with the kitab, Sunnah and ijma.” (Taysir'ul Aziz'il Hamiyd Sharhu Kitabu Tawhid, 58)

“Surely if one of the mushrik is to say ‘la ilaha illa Allah’ and is to express that ‘Muhammad is RasulAllah’ and if he performs salah, fasts, goes to hajj and only does this because he sees others doing this and subjects to them without performing any shirk but does not comprehend any of these actions, certainly no one will have doubt that this individual can not be considered Muslim. Likewise all of the maghrib fuqaha in the beginning of the 11th century (maybe even before) had given a fatawa regarding an individual as such. The Malikee scholar, the author of Ad Darr us Samyn fi sharh il Murshid il Muin had narrated this. He stated: “This matter which fatawa had been given about it is clearly an open matter. It is such that there is not even a chance that two people have ikhtilaf over it.” When it is looked at from this frame there will be no doubt that the graveworshippers situation is much disgusting than this. The reason is because they carry the belief regarding many different rabb being separate deities. (Taysir ul Aziz il Hamiyd Sharhu Kitabu Tawhid, 60)

The authors’ expression “certainly no one will have doubt that this individual can not be considered Muslim” carries the meaning Islam/ Muslim that will save one in the akhirah. The reason is because his distancing from shirk and outward appearance of Islam which protects his life and properties in this world and its hukm is upon Islam it originated from. This type of Islam by the fuqaha is called the hukm-i Islam (being Muslim only by hukm/outward appearance/ namely Muslim).

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) states: “However, most of the Muslim before any seen action of iman, have been given the hukm Muslim because they had been born to a Muslim mother and father. Later on when they grow up they either show actions of iman; in this means sincerely perform the actions of fard or some of them continue to perform these actions only because it has become a culture, their relatives do it and the people of the area they live in do it. For example, he will pay zakah. Hence it is a tradition, for the higher authority to collect a portion of the earnings. This individual who pays can not comprehend the genuineness or the detailed reason for the necessity of this action. Within this state of mind, to him there is not much difference between a made up tax and zakah. Or he will go up to Arafa with the people of Mecca every year because it has become a custom. Without acknowledging in summary or in details that this is an act of ibadah to Allah. Or he will fight with the kuffar because his tribe is fighting with them; he will fight because he is subjected to his tribe, etc. Here, there is doubt that the actions (ibadah) of this individual are invalid. On the contrary the Qur’an, Sunnah and the ijma of the ummah all state that these actions will not take the place of the fard. In other words with actions as such the fard will not be aborted. In the same manner the Islam of most is only a hukm of Islam (according to appearance, seen actions; not absolute and not irrevocable). This will only enter their hearts when they have been ordered, that is if it does (enter their hearts). So, were this intention not to be obligatory upon them, they would not at all attempt to have it, and their hearts would be empty of it, and they would essentially be hypocrites, carrying out their actions out of habit and imitation, as is the case with many people.” (Fatawa, 26/30-32)

1- Hukm-i Islam ‘Namely Muslim’

The outward state of the individual who has been attributed with Islam hukm-wise (namely Muslim) is

as follows –Only Allah knows his inward belief:-

He seems tawhid on the outside; meaning distant from shirk and performing the fard. However this individual does not expect any reward for what he has done nor any punishment for what he has neglected. This individual is only performing Islam in deep taqlid (imitation) of his ancestors. While performing all these he expects the praise (reward) from them and fears their punishment (anger). If his ancestors had not been in this situation they would not perform any of these actions and they'd abandon them. This is a condemned imitation. Fundamentally this is accepting what others had said without proof or any document. This is the opposite of imitating in haqq submitting to the one who has no partners, which is Allah.

The reason behind this is that contrary to the prior this is the deen of Allah. It is expecting His reward and fearing his punishment. He is following as necessary, His Nabi, questioning and researching. Likewise this individual is imitating someone who will provide the approval of Allah in both dunya and in the akhirah; otherwise the deen explained regardless of what it is because it belongs to their ancestors this is not suitable. Although an individual is still imitating in the later explained deen regardless of his ignorance in the evidence there is no doubt he is Muslim. This is without ikhtilaf among the ummah except for the ahl bid'ah. Whereas there is no value in having ikhtilaf in such matter anyway.

The first individual who has submitted to the deen of his ancestors does not research and he submits to this deen but has no worries over whether or not the deen is harmonious and fitting to the deen of Allah. This is a muqallid (imitator) individual.

The second researches the deen of Allah and compliance to the nabi. This individual is also a muqallid but this individual actualises Islam in dhahir (outward) and in batin (inward).

The first one only actualises Islam in the dhahir unless he performs an open act to negate it. However he will not have actualised Islam in batin. The hadith in Bukhari explains this. WALLahu Alim.

While commenting on the hadith of the questioning in the grave: "...as for the hypocrite or disbeliever, it will be asked of him: 'What did you say about this man?' He will say: 'I do not know! I used to say what I heard the people saying!'" Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani said: "And in it is the blameworthiness of believing in something in order to follow others, due to the punishment that will be met out to the one who said: 'I used to hear the people saying something, so, I said it.'" (Fath al-Bari'; 3/284)

In reality Ibn Taymiyyah had explained an individual as such before. The statement of Ibn Taymiyyah is as follows; they will not make shafaa of those who make this statement imitating their ancestors and elders.

As known as an absolute fact the munafiq will hear and repeat their ancestors saying Muhammad is the envoy of Allah. However he only says this to fall in their step and because of the condemning of their elders and ancestors! If people had said Musaylimah al Kazzab (may the curse of Allah be upon him) is the rasul they would follow their foot steps and say the same.

A group openly states the following: He is the envoy of Allah. However the same people in batin believe in the invalidity of him being an envoy. They are a type of munafiq. The hadith comprises all types of munafiq. Allah knows best.

The conclusion we have come to, from this is that without knowledge and al-yaqeen (certainty) this individual who actualises Islam only by dhahir (outward) will not find salvation although he distances from shirk and follows the hukm of Islam in the dhahir.

When it is like this, the individual who does not know the meaning of the kalimah shahadah and is infected with shirk also who is performing shirk, approving it and calling to it likewise befriending its muntasib, also does not like tawhid, abandones it and keeps individuals from it also treats its muntasib as enemies, what would be the condition of this individual?

e- The essence of tawhid is knowledge (Marifah) regarding Allah (jj)

Second Hadith

As mentioned in Bukhari and Muslim by Ibn Abbas (ra) the following was reported: "as RasulAllah (saw) sent Mu'adh (ra) into Yemen, He said to him: "you will go to a people, consisting of Jews and Christians. First thing which you should invite them to should be "La ilaha illallah". In another excessive extent it means: "first to which you should invite them, should be "Tawhid". If they do accept it..." (Bukhari, Muslim)

Hafid Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani said explaining this situation: "this is how it is declared by al-Qasim: "call them to ibaadah to Allah first. If they know Allahu taala with an exact knowledge, then call them to perform salaah (obligatory prayer)..." Al-Fadl ibn Ala states in another excessive extent "first call them to proclaim the oneness of Allah! If they know it, then in addition call them to perform salaah..." Out of these excessive extents the following is to be taken: To serve Allahu taala is to standardize it. The standardization of Allahu taala consists of the certification that there is no other who deserves to be prayed to but Allahu taala (tawhid), as well as the acceptance of the Prophet Hood of Muhammad (saw). The reason why humans are invited to these first, is, because they represent the basis of the religion. If these two are not sahih then no service becomes valid, because the validity of these services depends on the validity of the basis of the religion. Therefore; if humans invited to Islam are not Muwahhideen (one who proclaims the oneness of Allah), then the acceptance of either "La ilaha illallah" or "Muhammad un Rasulullah" is sufficient. But if they are Muwahhideen, they must accept "La ilaha illallah" and "Muhammad un Rasulullah" at the same time. If the people whom are being invited believe in Shirk or are giving Allahu Taala created attributes (i.e. human attributes), or saying that Uzayr Allah's son, then first of all things they must reject these beliefs. The words of RasulAllah (saw): "if they obey what you have brought them" means; if they do testify and obey to which you called them on to. Also Ibn Hudhayma's words "if they this accept" in the excessive measure carries the same meaning. It was mentioned already before, in Ala statement we come across to "if they know this" in the excessive

measure from al-Fadl. This Hadith shows that the Jews and Christian do not know God with an exact knowledge, even if they still so often adore and retain this. The scholars of the Tawhid say: "attributes that, which compares Allahu taala with Allah's own creations, such as ascribing a hand or son to him, did not know Allahu taala. Even if they call their worshiped creatures Allahu taala, they (the worshiped creatures) are not Allah." (Fathul Bari, 3, 418-420, chapter Zakah).

Surely whoever compares Allah with His creation or ascribes a child to Him; surely this will mean this individual is ignorant about Allah (awj):

"No just estimate have they made of Allah, such as is due to Him: On the Day of Judgment the whole of the earth will be but His handful, and the heavens will be rolled up in His right hand: Glory to Him! High is He above the Partners they attribute to Him!" (Az-Zumar 39/67) "No just estimate have they made of Allah: for Allah is He Who is strong and able to Carry out His Will." (al-Hajj 22/74) "there is nothing whatever like unto Him" (ash-Shura 42/11) "How can He have a son when He hath no consort? " (al-Anam 6/101) "He has taken neither a wife nor a son." (al-Jinn 72/3)

When it comes to the attribute given to Allah regarding His possession of hands this needs some explanation. Whoever is to make this claim thinking (believing) it to be like the hands of His creations he is a deviated mushabbiha (those who made Allah resemble/like man/creature). However whoever is to do this without resembling Him to His creations and only attributing appropriate to His jalal this act would be appropriate and evidence is waajib. Likewise in the Qur'an this has been mentioned and it has been repeated in the Sunnah also. This is the view of the ahl Sunnah. Success is from Allah (swt).

As understood from these narrations filled with lessons to learn and benefit, surely making shahadah of both tawhid and risalah is the asl of deen. It is necessary to begin with them because nothing will be sahih without them.

Whoever remains upon ignorance in uluhiyyah he will have remained ignorant of Allah. Therefore he will perform shirk to Allah even if he claims otherwise. This way his real idol will be other than Allah. We the Muslim are distant from any, such mabud (idol). As it is stated in the following ayah: "Say: O disbelievers! I worship not that which ye worship" (al-Kafiroon 109/1-2)

In the interpretation of the hadith; Nawawi narrates from Qadi Iyad that he says: "This shows they do not know Allah. This is the view of the prominent mutakallim (scholars) regarding the Jews and the Nasara (Christians): They do not know Allah (are not 'arif) although they make ibadah to Him and show they know Him because things as such are heard from them. Although 'aql does not stand in front of denying the Rasul and knowing Allah, the Jews who make similarities of Allah and resemble Allah to a being have not known Allah. Or those who state bada' (change in Allah's will) or believe Allah has a child likewise those from the Nasara had associated partners to Him and attributed a child to Him they believed it permissible for khulul (manifestation, display), intiqaal (transfer or change of place) and imtiza (adaptation) also the zoroastrian and those from among the sanawiyya (the sect which accepted a good and bad deity -duality) those who attribute things that aren't fitting, those who attribute associates and

partners all these individuals have not recognised (appreciated) Him as they should have. These idols they worship are not Allah; although they may name them to be. The reason is because these idols do not carry the attributes which must be carried by a mabud and this way they will not have recognised Allah. This matter has been clarified and I have taken this as a basis. Likewise I have seen the meaning of this from my prior sheikhs. For example Abu Imran al Farisi in front of the entire Qairawan nation had explained this while everyone had been discussing this. The statement of Qadi Iyad ends here.” (Nawawi sharh, 1/199-200)

f- It is Impossible to Worship Allah while in ‘Shirk’

In the tafsir of “Nor will ye worship that which I worship.” (al-Kafiroon 109/5) Ibn Taymiyyah stated: “This ayah takes in hand their shirk such that the worship they do is certainly not worship to Allah. Surely Allah will not accept any amal (act) that is not solely done for Him. Even if they make dua to Him, perform salah for Him when they make shirk they will not have worshiped Him solely. Therefore they do not worship the mabud (idol) which attributes had been clearly revealed and he (saw) worships. Because this is related to sole ibadaah to Him (awj) and Rabb which He informs as the owner of the ‘ism (name) and sifaat (attributes) genuine to Him. Whoever denies some of the sifaat he informs us of this individual will never will be accounted as having worshiped what he (saw) had worshiped. In the same sense it must be known that no matter how muhtalif the hukm regarding ibadaah are the mabud is One in all conditions; even if one ibadaah is not similar to the other. According to this it will not be distanced from those in this condition because whoever makes his deen ikhlas and ibadaah solely to Allah in all time beings this individual is Muslim. The ibadaah that he will do must certainly be an ibadaah Allah sees appropriate for him. (Fatawa, 16/550-600)

This is in the frame which must be commanded to all Muslims; even if an individual as such had made shirk to Allah before he had been informed of the message. He now and in the future is distancing from all sorts of ibadaah the mushrik perform in all eras and moreover he rejects the ibadaah they do to their mabud. As seen an individual in such situation according to the sharee'ah and as a matter of fact; as he does not permit such ibadaah he must distance from it. Therefore this (baatil ibadaah) will not occur nor will it be possible for it to occur.

When it comes to his statement regarding the kuffar: “Nor will ye worship that which I worship.” (al-Kafiroon 109/5)

This addressing had been to all the kuffar. Even if they had later on become Muslim. As long as they are upon kufr, this will be addressed to them. However when they become Islam this ayah will no longer comprise them because from that moment on they will become mu'min and are no longer kafir. If they are munafiq in batin; in this case they are still addressed. As long as the kafir remains a kafir he absolutely is not worshiping Allah. On the contrary he is only worshiping the shaitan. Whether he does this in the open or secretly like the Jewish it does not make a difference. Surely the Jewish do not worship Allah. In essence they are worshipping the shaitan because ibadaah to Allah can only be with what He had designated. Even if they claim they worship Him they perform mutilated and restricted

acts. Whereas Allah sees this karih (disgusting), curses and restricts it. In this state they are not acts of worship. Now as long as an individual who rejects Muhammad (saw) remains kafir he will not be worshipping what Muhammad worships. (Fatawa, 16/554)

Although the Jewish said we meant ibadaah to Allah they will have lied even if they knew they were lying or not. Just like the statement of the Nasara: we only worship Allah and we are not mushrik. With this statement they are liars because if they had wished to worship Him they would have worshiped Him as He commanded. Even this is within the measurements of the sharee'ah and can not be with mansuh (restricted) things. Like this the rabb they worship is only a rabb in their sight. This is not a rabb who has revealed neither the Injil nor the Qur'an. It has not sent the Mesiah or Muhammad. Moreover according to some of them this is poor; according to some stingy, according to some weak and according to some it is someone that is not capable of changing what it has brought. According to all of this, it has given strength to those liars who have slandered it. They claim he is His envoy while they are not envoys. Moreover they are deceitful and liars. According to them Allah has supported them, helped them in addition has helped those who submit to them against the mu'min. According to them differing from mankind they are the awliyah of Allah. This rabb that they worship is always helping their enemy.

They worship a rabb as such. The Rasul and the mu'min do not worship this mabud as the Jewish worship it. He is free from the attributes of the Jews to their mabuds in aspect of it being a mabud. Yes He is distant from such attribution. In this sense He (awj) is not the mabud of the Jewish. Surely in their culture there are some attributes but they will not be attributes for Him. The shaitan has beautified it. With these characteristics they mean to worship something that is qualified. This is solely from the shaitan. In this situation neither the Rasul nor none of the Mu'min will worship this thing the Jewish worship. (Fatawa, 16/563)

If it is said:

The mushrik worship both Allah and another. As stated in the ayah: "Do ye then see whom ye have been worshipping,- Ye and your fathers before you?-" (ash-Shuara 26/75-76) Here He (awj) had been an exception out of the things they worship. This shows they worshiped Allah. Likewise the following hadith: "I do indeed clear myself of what ye worship: (I worship) only Him Who made me, and He will certainly guide me." (az-Zukhruf 43/26-27) There is also an exception here. The following hadith of Husayn al Huzzai is in the Musnad and others: RasulAllah (saw) said to him: "O Husayn how many idols do ye worship in a day? He answered: Seven idols, six are on the ground and one in the sky..."

It is said this is the word of the mushrik. Hence the Jewish and the Nasrani also state 'we worship Allah'. By performing shirk to Him they believe they perform ibadaah to Him, whereas at this point they are only liars.

When it comes to the statement of Halilullah (as) there are two views

1- This is istisna-i munkati (meaning Allah is exceptional from all other worshiped things) Abdurrahman

b. Zayd stated: They were worshiping other deities alongside Allah. According to this; this statement is mukayyad (registered). Surely He (awj) states: "that which you worship". Here because the intention is understood they had attributed this as ibadaah. However this is not an ibadaah in the level of Allah. Surely it would have been as if Allah had said: I am inundated from the shirk of the associates. This is like the following ayah: "And most of them believe not in Allah without associating (other as partners) with Him!" (Yusuf 12/106) Even though this has been informed it had been named iman. Or else the mushrik is already the one who associates partners to Allah. And this is absolutely not included in the content of iman. He (awj) had said: they believe in idols and Taghout" (an-Nisa 4/51) "Announce to them a grievous penalty" (al-e-Imran 3/21) Along this record and release, iman is fundamentally iman in Allah: and good news will be with khayr.

The following ayah is one of those which explain this: "Were ye witnesses when death appeared before Jacob? Behold, he said to his sons: "What will ye worship after me?" They said: "We shall worship Thy god and the god of thy fathers, of Abraham, Isma'il and Isaac,- the one (True) Allah: To Him we bow (in Islam)."" (al-Baqarah 2/133)

The appreciation of the ayah is the following: We will worship your deity. We will worship one deity and we have submitted to Him. They have fitted the two messages with two situations. It is as such that they worship his ilah and worship only one ilah. Now whoever worships two deities this individual will not become a servant of both his deity and the deity of his ancestors. Surely the one who worships only one deity will have worshiped his deity. If the individual who worships Allah becomes a servant to another, this means his ibadaah is of two kinds:

a-Ibadaah of shirk; b-Ibadaah of tawhid.

Whoever is worshiping another alongside Him this individual will not be accounted to worship one deity. The one to make shirk to Him will not have made ibadaah to Him. The reason is because He can only be the One and Only ilah. Now if he has not worshiped Him in a situation he is need of, there will not be another situation he will worship Him. In this state he will not have worshiped Him.

If it is said that the mushrik is taking another ilah besides Him; he is worshiping in a state that Allah is not the only deity. As a response it will be said this is incorrect. The source of this is: Surely with the word ilah the one deserving uluhiyyah is meant. Besides, other things mankind take on as deities can be meant. Moreover they are names they themselves and their ancestors have made up. Basically this is not ilah per se. This is only deity ship amongst those who worship it, this deity ship is a matter recognised by the mushrik. They had constituted this without any agreement from the outer world. (Fatawa 16/572)

"We shall worship Thy god and the god of thy fathers, of Abraham, Isma'il and Isaac, - the one (True) Allah: To Him we bow (in Islam)." (al-Baqarah 2/133) This expression is mansub upon state. It is either the state of the abd or the mabud in the state of mafhul. In the first state it will mean: When we are in a state of ikhlas we will only worship Him. In the second state it will mean we will worship Him only in a

state necessary for Him. Surely He is only one deity. For this reason we will with ikhlas push aside others and worship Him only; confessing He is the only deity. If the meaning of the ayah is the second this will mean it will prevent the mushrik from being servants to Him; because surely the mushrik is not worshipping Him. Hence He has not informed us of another state to perform ibadaah. If the meaning of the ayah is to be the first one according to this we can worship Him in other ways also. For instance the possibility of people attaining other deities can occur. However the statement 'only one ilah' is proof it is the state of the mabud. This is the opposite of the following: we will worship Him making deen particular to Him. It is because this is the state of the doer. For this reason there are many examples of this in the Qur'an: "therefore serve Allah, being sincere to Him in obedience" (az-Zumar 39/2) "It is Allah I serve, with my sincere (and exclusive) devotion." (az-Zumar 39/14) The state in these is the state of the doer. Surely sometimes he will be with ikhlas and sometimes mushrik. Whereas Rabb taa'la is always One ilah.

Likewise in the sentence "the one (True) Allah: To Him do we submit (in Islam)" the waw here is atf also it has been said to be waw-i haliya. Meaning we will worship Him in this state. When it comes to the part in the ayah 'only one ilah' without discussion this is regarding the state of the mabud. According to this it is necessary they worship the mabud which is the only one ilah, which is also a stated necessary for the mabud. 'To Him we submit'... Their submission to Him includes making deen solely to Him, to bow (submit) to Him and contradicting the non-Muslim submitting truthfully (bihaqq) to His hukm. (Fatawa, 16/587)

"Nor will ye worship that which I worship" (al-Kafiroon 109/3) this invalidates their worship to their own mabud. In this case when they worship Allah as mushrik they are not worshipping his mabud. Like this when he is worshipping Allah making deen particular to Him he is not worshipping their mabud.

The fifth chapter: If they if they had appointed Allah as one that is really not Allah (if they attribute specialties that do not suit Him) and if they worship it believing it is Allah they are just like those who worship the calf, the Masiah, the dajjal and those who worship dunya, their own hawa and desires.

Likewise from this ummah whoever worships anything thinking it is Allah when it is not is in the same situation as them. An individual as such will not be distancing from those idols when he says 'I will not worship what ye worship'; even if the intention of those abd (worshippers) from the mabud (idols) is Allah.

Sixth chapter: When they attribute Allah with things that do not suit Him, for example a spouse, a child, a partner or claiming He is poor, stingy etc. and when they worship Him in this state obviously Allah (awj) will baraa (distance) from those mabud with those attributes (characteristics). (Fatawa 16/600) Because under no circumstance is this Allah." (Fatawa 16/550-600)

1- The Conditions of Ibadaah

As clearly understood from these narrations ibadaah to Allah (jj) can only be done in a manner He (jj) finds suitable. This means ibadaah can not be performed by hawa, desire, suspicions, culture and with

things which have been invalidated. Surely the reality of ibadaah will only materialise in the condition that the servant inclines towards wahid and kahhar Allah (the one and only who has no partners). It is obligatory that during the inclination of the servant to Allah he is Muslim. Surely any mushrik which claims to worship Allah absolutely has not known Allah and will not be worshipping Allah. The reason is because shirk will invalidate uluhiyyah. Moreover it is an attack to the right of Rububiyyah, whether the mushrik had meant this or escaped this.

Therefore Ibn Qayyim (ra) said: shirk will cause deficiency in rububiyyah. Whether the mushrik wishes it or not this deficiency is essential for them. For this reason He Subhanahu had destined such individual not be forgiven. Also He has commanded the doer stay in eternal torment and has described them as the worst among the creatures. You will not be able to find a mushrik which does not link Allah with deficiency and even if they claim it exalts Him.” (Ighasatu’l-Lahfan, 1/62-63)

According to this the mushrik had claimed bad of his rabb and has compared Him with things He does not deserve alongside invalidating His specialties which are the necessities of Him and His Deityship. Allah is much exalt than their attributes.

Ibni Qayyim (ra) stated the following: “Is it a falsehood- gods other than Allah- that ye desire? Then what is your idea about the Lord of the worlds?” (as-Saffat 37/86-87) Meaning what did you expect He’d give you when you had worshipped others besides Him? What is that which made you think as such that you associated partners to Him? Did you think He was in need of partners and helpers? Or did you think that He does not know the state of His servants and like the sultan and was in need of partners? Or did you think He would not be sufficient on His own to manage and take care of them? Or did you think He is hard hearted? Moreover did you see Him in distraught and to be freed from humiliation and to be strong needed friends? Or did you think He needed a son and took on a spouse to have a child for Him? Allah (awj) is Greater and free from all of this.” (Madarij, 3/325)

2- Shirk is the indication of ignorance

In this approach you will see that absolutely all mushrik have bad suspicions about their rabb and this suspicion is a direct accusation and negation of His uluhiyyah and rububiyyah. For this reason you will see the mabud he worshiped is not Allah. Even if their claim is different because his mabud is only the shaitan –may the curse of Allah be upon him-. From this we understand that no mushrik has knowledge (recognition) of Allah. Again even if their claim is different, likewise this is the meaning of RasulAllah’s (saw) statement regarding the ahl kitab: ‘when they know Allah’ this negates the logic of those who claim the following; whoever states that servantry is for Allah not in detail but in general -meanwhile this individual who makes this statement also makes dua to any other than Allah, sacrifices to another, makes votive offerings to any other than Allah- this would mean this individual is not worshipping any other than Allah. This individual is Muslim in dunya and is saved on the Day of Judgment, now this claim; this logic is without doubt completely baatil. Because worship to Allah can only be without shirk and only by inclination to Allah. Also the individual inclined to Him must be a pure Muslim to wahid and kahhar Allah (awj). Let alone shirk already invalidates the ibadaah of this servant. For this reason he will

not be attributed as making ibadaah to Allah.

The evidence for what had been mentioned is open and clear inshaAllah in the following hadith mentioned in the sahih: "Allah will gather people on the Day of Resurrection and say: Let every people follow what they worshipped. Those who worshipped the sun would follow the sun, and those who worshipped the moon would follow the moon, and those who worshipped the taghout would follow the taghout."

As known whoever worships the taghout, moon and sun thinks he is absolutely worshipping Allah. However this individual in reality is worshipping the taghout. For this reason the inclination in the gathering place on the Day of Judgment is to those things and not to Allah. In this situation after they are distanced from the ahl kitab and munafiq those who do not perform shirk to Allah, who make deen pure and worship only Him are left. Likewise it has been mentioned in the hadith as such.

As understood from this hadith surely ibadaah to Allah can only be materialised without the performance of shirk and by inclining towards Him sincerely and in Islam. When it is like this for the mushrik –whoever the mushrik may be- not a portion is left from ibadaah to Allah. Every mushrik is ignorant of his rabb. He is callous towards ibadaah to his rabb. It does not matter if the mushrik does this willingly or not, it is like this in essence.

In the explanation the author of Kurrat'u Uyun'il-Muwahhidin of the following hadith he says: "First thing which you should invite them to should be "La ilaha illallah"" They'll say this. However they are ignorant of what it means. This is abandoning ibadaah to all others but Him and worshipping Him without shirk. For this reason their statement of la ilaha illa Allah does not benefit them because of their ignorance in the meaning. Just like many of those who later came to this ummah. Surely they state this but they say it while performing shirk which concerns the dead, the unknown, the taghout and the tombs. These (actions) invalidate it (their statement). Therefore their itikat, statement and actions invalidate what they state (la ilaha illa Allah). Likewise they negate ikhlas etc which prove it.

From here it could also be understood that the tawhid ibadaah is the first duty which is waajib because it is the foundation of the ummah and asluddeen.

When it comes to the view of the ahl kalam and those who submit to them; 'surely the first duty is to reach the 'ilm of Allah with evidence and sight' basically it is a situation of fitrah. Allah had created His servants upon this and for this reason the invitation of the envoys commence with tawhid ibadaah.

"Worship Allah! ye have no other god but Him." (al-Muminoon 23/32) Meaning only worship Allah.

"Not a messenger did We send before thee without this inspiration sent by Us to him: that there is no god but I; therefore worship and serve Me." (al-Anbiya 21/25)

"Their messengers said: Is there a doubt about Allah, The Creator of the heavens and the earth?"

(Ibrahim 14/10)

Imad b. Kathir, had stated this ayah carries two possibilities:

a. Is there any doubt of His existence? Whereas the fitrah had been created upon stating and attesting to His existence. Fundamentally admission to His existence is inevitable in a sound fitrah.

b. Is there any doubt that uluhiyyah and ibadaah must only be done to Him? Whereas He is the creator of everything that exists. For this reason He is the only one deserving to be worshiped without any partner. Surely most nations accept Him as the creator. However besides Him they also worship other intermediaries and they believe these will benefit them and get them closer to Allah.

As mentioned before, la ilaha illa Allah has been fixed to many important conditions in the book and sunnah. For example 'ilm, al yaqeen (certainty), ikhlas, truth, love, acceptance, going after and rejecting all others worshipped but Allah. When the conditions and the one who state this come together only then will it benefit them. If all of these do not come together it will not benefit the one who makes his statement. People are all sorts in 'ilm and amal. To some of them this statement will benefit and to others it will not. Fundamentally this is a clear state. (Kurrat'u Uyun'il-Muwahhidin, 48)

After this is there need for an explanation? After Him being evidence is there any need for any other? After His evidence is there need for any other?

As understood the 'ilm of Allah is the first of the waajib upon His creation. Nevertheless the essence of tawhid the shahadatayn brought by the rasul must be well known. This is understood from the following hadith: "when they know Allah" (Bukhari) this meaning with the will of Allah is special skill regarding Allah.

This special skill ships one to make tawhid uluhiyyah and to distance from worshiping any other than Him (awj). This is established by ijma. It is also the necessary duty. Likewise in both dunya, none other than it will be beneficial. Fundamentally this is mentioned in many sources.

At this point there is an issue which must be addressed. Surely what is meant by the necessary 'ilm is the 'ilm of tawhid uluhiyyah and the 'ilm regarding the attributes of Allah which is necessary to distance from those other than Allah. This will benefit its owner even if it is by just asking or imitating. Regarding this there is the ittifaq of the ummah other than the mutazilah and those inclined to them. They had fixed iman to some bid'ah and had fornicated rules. Some of these rules are correct but most are baatil. As if these are not enough they had made this necessary for all servants according to these rules to personally prove. Also they bring forth as a requirement of usul, to be known by each individual, which is based on their ijtihaad and which is opposing the usuluddeen of the Muslim. According to them no one is excused until this point and they have called this usuluddeen. Anything left out of this is included in furu'ud and excuses are possible here.

Ibn Taymiyyah calls this the bid'ah of dividing the deen in portions of usul and furu. Ibn Taymiyyah informs this as a refutation to the mutazilah and ahl kalam and their made up matters and fabricated evidences. The ahl Sunnah had always rejected the things they have fabricated. (Details regarding this matter will be touched upon in the section 'Riding the Doubts' inshaAllah and also check [Refutation against the view of Murjiah: "It is bid'ah to separate deen in sections of Asl and Furu."](#)) The difference between these two matters must be paid attention to.

g- 'Ilm is a Necessity Prior to Statement and Amal 'deed'

Imam al-Bukhari (d.256H) (ra) used a chapter titled as "Knowledge comes before statement and action." under the light of the verse: "Know, therefore, that there is no god but Allah" (Muhammad, 47-19) in his Sahih.

al-Hafidh Ibn Hajar (d.852H) (ra) commented upon this statement saying: "Ibn Muner stated; according to his statement "Knowledge comes before statement and action.": so knowledge is a condition for the correctness of the statement and action. So these two (statement and action) are not held in high esteem, except due to it (knowledge), so it must take precedence over them; since the correctness of the intention is a prerequisite for the correctness of action." (Fath ul Bari 1/160)

This statement of the Hafidh is very clear and definite. For the statement and amal to be accepted 'ilm is necessary and there is no dispute regarding this. On the contrary the dispute is among the ahl kalam regarding the necessity of learning the evidences in the frame of the rules narrated in their books.

Hafidh al Khatib al Baghdaadi (d.463H) (ra) said: "So knowledge is a tree, and actions are its fruit. The one who does not act upon his knowledge is not to be counted as being a scholar. And it is said, the knowledge is the father, and actions are its offspring. And action comes after knowledge, and narration comes after investigation. So do not feel content with action, as long as you are deficient in knowledge." (Iqtidaa'ul-'Ilmil-'Amal, 5-6)

Nawawi in his 'sharh of Muslim' stated "the bab of whoever dies upon tawhid will absolutely enter jannah." There are many hadith in this bab and they all come to the following meaning: "It is narrated on the authority of 'Abbas b. 'Abdul-Muttalib that he heard RasulAllah saying: "He relished the flavor of faith (Iman) who became the book of faith pleased with Allah as Lord,"

Know that the madhhab of the ahl sunnah and the ahl haqq from the salaf and khalaf defend the following view: Whoever is to die as a muwahhid will surely enter jannah such as an individual free of sins for example a child, insane or the one whose insanity continue throughout puberty, the one who makes sincere tawbah from sins and has not performed an act of sin after the tawbah and the individual who has never become addicted to sin. All these counted will enter jannah and will never enter jahannam. However according to another known hadith they will enter jahannam. The correct view is that they will pass sirat which is set above jahannam –may Allah save us from all sorts of crookedness-. When it comes to those which die without making tawbah although they have great sins they are left to

Allah. If Allah wills He will forgive and let them into jannah and make them the first group. If He (awj) wills He will punish them as He wills and then let them in jannah.

No one who dies upon tawhid will stay in jahannam forever; even if he has sinned. It is just like the one who dies upon kufr will not enter jannah even if he has performed amal that is considered as good deed. This is a summary of those of ahl haqq. In this matter the evidence from the kitab and sunnah also with the ijma of those trusted from the ummah all unite upon this. Moreover regarding this matter there has been sufficient amount of evidence which has reached us. When the mentioned is stabilised in such way this and other hadith in other bab related to this will be interpreted in such way. If there has been a hadith narrated which oppose this in the dhahir it must be made ta'weel of according to these. The intention is that the evidence of sharee'ah are all in harmony. We will inshaAllah mention the valid ta'weel of some hadith. (Muslim)

And Imam Nawawi mentions the quotation made from Qadi Iyad and states: "when it comes to the meaning of this "He who died knowing (fully well) that there is no god but Allah entered Paradise." (Muslim) and similar hadith surely Qadi Iyad had interpreted them giving excellent information about them. I will give a summary of his interpretations. Later I will try to make additions."

1- Marifat (knowledge) and Expression is the Necessity of Salvation

Qadi Iyad stated: "People had fallen in ikhtilaf regarding those from among the ahl shahadah who rebel Allah (awj). From among them:

The Murjiah said: with iman there is no damage masiyah can do.

The Khawaarij said: it will harm him and with it he will be kafir.

The Mutazilah said: if his masiyah is great he will remain in eternal jahannam. In this state he will not be described as a mu'min or a kafir. And he will be attributed as fasiq.

The Ashari said: on the contrary he is mu'min. If he is not forgiven he will be punished.

However later on he will be taken out of jahannam and probably will be put in jannah.

In essence this hadith is not against the Khawaarij and mutazila. When it comes to the murjiah if they use the dhahir of the hadith as evidence it will be said to them that this hadith will be made ta'weel of that he will either be forgiven or with shafaa he will be taken out of jahannam and put in jannah. In this case it will mean that he will enter jannah after he is punished. This hadith must be made ta'weel of because there are many other hadith that explain the rebels will be punished. For this reason the mentioned hadith must be made ta'weel of so there aren't any contradictions in evidences in the sharee'ah. Also in His (awj) statement "He knows/knowingly there is a refutation to the gulat murjiah. They state surely only the dhahir of kalimat shahadah will reunite one with jannah even if the individual does not believe in this from his heart. Likewise this has been recorded in many other hadith. For example: 'without any doubt in these'. This reinforces what we say. Also because the hadith is content with 'ilm those who believe that before uttering the shahadatayn by tongue that knowing it by heart will benefit him had made ihtijaj (come to a conclusion) from this hadith. Whereas the view of the ahl sunnah; marifah is recorded with shahadatayn and is fixed to it. As one of them is not beneficial without the other it will not save one from fire either. However the individual who does not have the power to utter the shadatayn

due to a disability of tongue or sudden death that his time hadn't been sufficient for him to utter this individual is exceptional. (Muslim)

Firstly we declare the following

The salafy salihun, the ahl hadith and fuqaha, the mutakallim and from the ashari those who carry this thought altogether as ahl sunnah have stated:

Surely the sinful individuals are in the hands of Allah (awj). Also the individual who dies upon iman and stating the shahadah by heart and with ikhlas will enter jannah. If he has made tawbah and is distant from sins he will enter jannah with the rahmah of his Rabb and will be altogether saved from fire. It is possible all these hadith are mustakil. In this case they will settle the dispute. And at this point what had been meant by 'to deserve jannah' the matter narrated by the ijma of the ahl sunnah will be as follows: it is necessary that all muwahidun enter it. Either right away by being forgiven or he will be saved right after being punished. What had been meant by the fire being haraam is the eternal restriction of it; contrary to the Khawaarij and mutazilah.

Nawawi stated: the narrations of Qadi ends here. These which he had explained are well-fitted." (Nawawi Sharh, 1/217-219; Muslim)

Qadi stated 'the madhhab of the ahl sunnah said marifah is fixed to shahadatayn. With only one of them it will not be beneficial nor will it save' and Imam Nawawi stated these are very good evaluations. This is the madhhab of the ahl sunnah. They state: expressing is connected with marifah, without one the other will not be beneficial. Just like a statement without knowledge, knowledge without statement. Neither of these will benefit its doer nor will it save it.

Regarding the following hadith: "Take away these sandals of mine, and when you meet anyone outside this garden who testifies that there is no god but Allah, being assured of it in his heart, gladden him by announcing that he shall go to Paradise." (Muslim) Imam Nawawi stated: "In this hadith there is open evidence for those of ahl haqq; surely the itikad of tawhid will not benefit without statement likewise statement without itikad has no benefit either. On the contrary both of these must be united. This had been explained at the beginning of the subject." (Nawawi Sharh, 1/237)

2-The condition of Shafaa is Tawhid

It is absolute that other than the individual who expresses the kalimat shahadah, ends shirk who assimilates tawhid in dhahir and batin no one will be saved from eternal punishment in jahannam. The following hadith provides us evidence to this finality:

RasulAllah (saw) said: There is for every apostle a prayer which is granted, but every prophet showed haste in his prayer. I have, however, reserved my prayer for the intercession of my Ummah on the Day of Resurrection, and it would be granted, if Allah so willed, in case of everyone amongst my Ummah provided he dies without associating anything with Allah.

Regarding this hadith Nawawi stated: there is evidence of the ahl haqq madhhab in his (saw) statement of "it would be granted, if Allah so willed, in case of everyone amongst my Ummah

provided he dies without associating anything with Allah.” The ahl haqq states: Surely any individual who dies without shirk will not stay in jahnnam eternally. Even if he performs kabair (major sins) continuously. Evidence regarding this had been narrated elsewhere also. “ (Muslim, Nawawi sharh 3/75)

Again the following sahih and clear hadith mentioned in Sahih Muslim provides evidence to the matter: “When Allah would finish judging His bondsmen and because of His mercy decide to take out of Hell such people as He pleases. He would command the angels to bring out those who had not associated anything with Allah; to whom Allah decided to show mercy. Those who would say: There is no god but Allah. They (the angels) would recognise them in the Fire by the marks of prostration, for Hell-fire will devour everything (limb) of the sons of Adam except the marks of prostration. Allah has forbidden the fire to consume the marks of prostration.”

Other than those who have not performed shirk no one will be saved from eternal punishment in the akhirah and the one who dies with a heart satisfied of tawhid will not remain in fire eternally. Another hadith mentioned in Muslim is “O my Lord, no one has been left but he whom the Holy Qur'an has restrained.” Meaning other than those who must necessarily stay in fire. In his narration Ibn Ubaydah stated: According to Qatadah this meaning those which it is wajib to stay constantly. Nawawi stated: In his (saw) statement “no one has been left but he whom the Holy Qur'an has restrained” he means except for those who must stay there.

Muslim said that the statement ‘those who must stay’ belongs to Qatadah. This is a sahih tafsir and the meaning of it is, those which the Qur'an informs must stay in fire eternally. They are the kafir and as Allah stated: “Allah forgiveth not that partners should be set up with Him” (an-Nisa 4/48)

Here there is evidence for the matter which ijma had been by ahl haqq madhhab and the salaf. Surely any individual who dies upon tawhid will not stay in fire eternally. (Nawawi Sharh, 3/58-59)

Likewise the following hadith mentioned in Sahih Muslim is also the same: “By him in Whose hand is my life, you shall not enter Paradise unless you believe.” In another narration it is as follows: “Behold, no one but a believing person would enter Paradise. O Allah, (see) have I conveyed (it not)? O Allah, be witness (to it that I have conveyed it).”

Nawawi stated: His (saw) expression of “no one but a believing person would enter Paradise” is an open nass for the following matter:

Surely the individual who dies upon kufr can never enter jannah. This nass is general according to the ijma of the Muslim. (Nawawi, 3/96)

Fundamentally this rule is mutawatir in nass of the sharee'ah and in the statements of the ulama. It is as such that this expression is related with 'ilm and even this is a necessity in the salvation and benefit of the servant. On the other hand it is the first duty wajib upon the servant.

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) stated: "Abu Muhammad Abdullah b. Ahmad al Hulaydi had written a sharh

to the book Itikad u Ahl sunnah written by Abu Ali al Husayn b. Ahmad at-Tabari, (this individual had possibly reached Ahmad etc.) regarding the marifah of Allah he states: This is the first fard. It is such fard that it is impossible a Muslim remains ignorant of (it is not an excuse). Fundamentally obedience will not benefit an individual as such even if he comes with the obedience of the entire ahl dunya until marifah and takwa regarding Allah is constituted upon him. As known upon the individual who thinks over the creatures of Allah (awj) and the strange things He (awj) has created -such as the exchange of day and night, the sun, the moon the beginning and the end etc- marifah regarding Allah will increase. Allah (awj) stated: "As also in your own selves: Will ye not then see the signs?" (adh-Dhariyat 51/21)

From the open and clear nabawi nass and the statements of the salaf we withdraw the following conclusions:

1- Surely in the acceptance of the kalimah shahadah it is necessary to know its meaning. It is stated in the hadith "until they say", "until they make shahadah", "until they reject those worshiped other than Allah", "whoever makes tawhid of Allah" and in the hadith of Muad (ra) "until they know (have 'ilm regarding) Allah"

2- Surely the mushrik does not know Allah and does not worship Allah. Shirk nullifies the attribute of uluhiyyah of One Allah and this way his mabud becomes the shaitan. Even if he claims the opposite this mabud is not Allah.

3- Surely without becoming abstract and cleansing from shirk stating the shahadatayn will not benefit its owner.

4- Surely expressing the kalimat shahadah is related with marifah (knowledge). Without one the other will not benefit.

5- Surely aim of war and it originating from the mushrik is fixed to the fundament that they worship only Allah, they assimilate to tawhid, and they accept only the hukm of Allah without any associates.

Besides the nass mentioned in the Qur'an and Sunnah, also the understanding of the sahabah (ra) -with the will and rahmah of Allah- reinforces this. According to this surely the intention of fighting with the mushrik is to ensure they make tawhid of Allah in ibadaah. The nass regarding this matter will be understood according to its dhahir.

"Narrated Jubair bin Haiya: 'Umar sent the Muslims to the great countries to fight the pagans... So, 'Umar sent us (to Khosrau) appointing An-Numan bin Muqrin as our commander. When we reached the land of the enemy, the representative of Khosrau came out with forty-thousand warriors, and an interpreter got up saying, "Let one of you talk to me!" Al-Mughira replied, "Ask whatever you wish." The other asked, "Who are you?" Al-Mughira replied, "We are some people from the Arabs; we led a hard, miserable, disastrous life: we used to suck the hides and the date stones from hunger; we used to wear clothes made up of fur of camels and hair of goats, and to worship trees and stones. While we were in this state, the Lord of the Heavens and the Earths, Elevated is His Remembrance and Majestic is His Highness, sent to us

from among ourselves a Prophet whose father and mother are known to us. Our Prophet, the Messenger of our Lord, has ordered us to fight you till you worship Allah Alone or give Jizya (i.e. tribute). (Bukhari)

This nass is from Mughira b Shuba. He had said this in a Muslim society without any objection. This quite ijma comes from the first generation (ra). For this reason it is clear and open evidence that the aim of war is so they make tawhid of Allah in worship, to accept solely Him (awj) as ilah without associating any partner, to ensure they abandon worshiping other gods, deities, taghout, idols etc.

It is important to pay attention to the understanding and attributes of the selef and the imam of Islam. Especially Sheikhu'l Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn Qayyim and Muhammad b. Abdulwahhab. From all of their views regarding this matter it is closely understood that without doubt the mushrik and the graveworshippers are distant from the attribute of Islam/ Muslim. Likewise, for the existence of Islam; knowledge of tawhid and assimilation is necessary.

Umar ibn al-Khattaab (ra) said: "There is no excuse for anyone going astray thinking that he is upon guidance. Nor for abandoning guidance thinking it to be misguidance, since the affairs have been made clear, the proof established and the excuse cut off." (Ibn Battah; al-Ibanatul-Kubra, no. 162)

Umar ibn 'Abdul-'Aziz (ra) said: "There is no excuse for anyone, after the Sunnah, to be misguided upon error which he thought was guidance." (al-Marwazi; as-Sunnah, no.95)

And Allah is Al-Musta'an.

4- The description of Islam from the scholars

a- The Necessity of Tawhid for the Validity of ones Islam

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) stated:

"Surely tawhid is the asl of iman. This is the alamate fariqa between the ahl jannah and ahl jahannam. It is the fee of jannah. For this reason no ones Islam without it will be correct." (Fatawa, 24/235)

"This is from them also: Surely the aim of those who see it permissible to travel to the grave of RasulAllah is the travel to his masjid. It is permissible by ijma on the contrary to other places that traveling to his (saw) masjid...

Surely he will reach that grave however if he is an individual drowned in ignorance and deviation he will think the journey made to his (saw) masjid is for his grave. He will think this is why salah performed (in that masjid) there, is equivalent to a thousand salah. They would think if the grave hadn't been there this masjid would not be any worthy than the others. Or this masjid has been built there due to this grave...

Whoever thinks this about the masjid of our nabi (saw) is the most deviated of mankind and most

ignorant of the deen Islam. Likewise will be the most ignorant regarding RasulAllah (saw) himself, His (saw) friends, statements and actions. Fundamentally this individual is indigent of all matters he is ignorant of; until he enters Islam and so that he does not take some of Islam and abandon some of it.

Yes this is the itikad of the Nasrani. According to them the virtue of the bayt makdis is due to the assertion that it had been built upon the grave of the one who had been hung. They hold that valuable than bayt makdis. These are the most deviated and ignorant of mankind. Again this is very similar to the thought of the mushrik regarding masjid haraam. They go there and leave because of the idols. Those who visit the graves and make dua, those who fear other than Allah and have expectations from them, are like the mushrik who is afraid of their deity and expects from them. (Fatawa, 27/254-256)

“The deen of Islam is dependent on two bases”

These are the actualization of shahadah that there is no other deity worthy of worship but Allah and that Muhammad is his envoy.

The first is: Not to take on deities alongside Allah, not to love any creature like one would love Allah; not to expect from, like one would expect from Allah likewise not to fear any other like one would fear Allah. Whoever is to equate the creator with the creature in these matters he will have without doubt committed shirk. He would be from those who perform shirk against his rabb. If this person is to believe that Allah created the samawat and ard he would still have attained other deities besides Allah.

The second is: the second basis Islam relies on is to perform ibadaah to Allah (awj) as legalized by the tongues of the prophets. We can only perform ibadaah to Him (awj) upon a waajib and mustahab command. When it comes to mubah if worship is meant from it, then it is also included in this. Dua is among ibadaah, whoever is to make dua (call upon) to some one who has died and is not present and requests help because he has done this without the waajib or mustahab command of Allah (awj) and His Rasul; he will have innovated a bid'ah in deen, made shirk to Rabbil Alemin and will have taken a path other than the Muslimeen.” (Fatawa, 1/310)

“Islam includes the submission only to Allah. The one who has submitted to another besides Allah will have become mushrik (performed shirk). The one who does not submit to Him (awj) will have turned his face from ibadaah to him. A mushrik is the kafir who turns his face from His (awj) ibadaah. Submitting only to Him (awj) is an expression ibadaah only to Him (awj) and obedience only to Him (awj). This is the deen of Islam which Allah accepts no other.

Submitting and becoming Muslim will only actualize with the command of Allah in the way He (awj) commanded...

Whoever is to not believe after the message of Muhammad (saw) had reached him he will be neither Muslim nor Mu'min. On the contrary even if he thinks he is Muslim or Mu'min he will be kafir. (Fatawa, 3/91-93)

The deen Islam is submitting only to Allah in a manner Allah is pleased with and with the deen He had sent through His envoys. The asl of this is in the hearts. And that is to bow to Him with ibadaah only to Him. Whoever is to perform ibadaah to Him and any other will not be considered Muslim.

Likewise those who do not perform ibadaah to Him moreover escapes from making ibadaah to Him will not at all be considered as Muslim. The reason is because Islam is submitting only to Allah. This is obedience to Him and ibadaah to Him. The scholars of language have also said this: when an individual has submitted it will be said he has become Islam. Fundamentally Islam is a form of act; the action of the heart and limbs. Iman is asl, attesting, testifying and 'ilm. This is the word (statement) of the heart which is also the action of heart. The basis of this is attesting and the action is bound by it." (Fatawa, 7/263)

b- The acceptance of Islam necessitates practicing the hukm

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) stated: "It is known that if we presume that a tribe had said to the Nabi (saw): we believe in the things you have brought without any doubt by heart, we state the kalimat shahadah by our tongues however we will not obey you in any command or restriction you bring us. According to this we will not perform salah, we will not fast, and we will not perform hajj. We will not speak well and we will not return the entrusted. We will not stand behind our word; we will not make silai raheem (visit relatives). By not obeying to any khayir you have commanded we will consume alcohol, we will fornicate and marry close relatives (incest). Those which we have strength over from your ashab and ummah we will kill and confiscate their properties. Moreover we will kill you and we will fight against you with your enemies. Now in this situation no sane individual can think the Nabi would say: You are mu'min upon iman! And on the Day of Judgment you will be among those I make shafaa to! It will be hoped that no one among you will enter jahannam. On the contrary the Muslim will essentially know that the Nabi (saw) will say: you are the most ferocious of mankind who perform kufr to what I bring. In this state if you do not repent you will be beheaded!" (Fatawa, 7/287)

He also said: "A group from the Jewish came to the Nabi (saw) and said: We testify that you are the Rasul of Allah. However they had not become Muslim by this means. The reason for this is because they had only said this to inform of what is inside. Meaning we know and absolutely declare that you are the envoy of Allah. RasulAllah immediately replied: why don't you submit to me then? They answered: we fear the Jewish. It is known that pure 'ilm and informing it is not iman. Not until one acts upon it which is a necessity of iman which also includes assimilation and bowing (obeying) and then informs us of his condition. For example the munafiq are kafir because their informing is pretend. Those individuals had informed without assimilating and without humility. For this reason they had been kafir in both dhahir and batin." ...The state of Abu Talib is as such also. There had been many narrations that he knew RasulAllah was a prophet. He had even said the following: "I knew that the deen of Muhammad is the most khayr in all deen" Due to his love for the deen of his ancestors and because he did not want his tribe to criticize him; Abu Talib had avoided stating the nubuwwa. Due to the fact that with his baatil knowledge, his love for baatil and the love which keeps distant from the opposite of those which make one revolted by haqq and obedience can not be together he did not become Mu'min." (Fatawa, 7/561)

Ibn Qayyim stated: In this sense it was not sufficient that a priest of the ahl kitab state the prophet hood of RasulAllah (saw) in order to become Muslim. In order to become Muslim it is necessary that he obeys the Prophet (saw) and follow him. After this statement of acceptance his actualizing of the necessities of his own deen would not necessarily mean he has made irtidad. The example for this matter is when the two Jewish scholars said: we make shahadah that you are the prophet RasulAllah (saw) had said: in that case what is it that withholds you from submitting to me? As a response they said: we fear the Jews will kill us. Their solitary shahadah does not mean they have become Muslim. (For example the uncle of RasulAllah (saw) Abu Talib had made shahadah that he (saw) was true to his (saw) proposition and that his (saw) deen was the most khayir among the deen on earth. However this shahadah was not sufficient for him to be Islam.) Those who think of the life of RasulAllah, in his siyar and in sahih narrations, most of the ahl kitab and mushrik had made shahadah that he had been true to his (saw) proposition and his prophet hood but did not enter Islam, will see that Islam is not something above this, it is not only knowledge, it is not only 'ilm and expression (understanding the prophet hood and accepting is) on the contrary the establishment Islam is 'ilm, statement, obedience to the commands and restrictions, compliance in dhahir, batin every matter." (Zad'ul Maad 3/42)

And also he stated: "According to this surely RasulAllah did not give the hukm Islam to the Jewish who had made shadadah to the trueness of risalah. The reason is because pure expression of risalah and informing of it does not make one Islam (Muslim). Not until one goes after it and complies with it. Likewise if one is to say I know he is the nabi, however I can not submit to him and I do not embrace the deen this individual will be from among the ferocious kafir. Like the state of these mentioned and others. This matter is muttafiqun alayh among the sahabah, tabi'een and the imam of Sunnah. Surely in iman neither the pure language nor the marifah of iman is sufficient. On the contrary the action of heart is also necessary; this is the love of Allah and His envoy, obedience to His deen obedience to Him and comply with His envoy. This is to the hilaf of those who say the abstract knowledge of the heart and its expression." (Miflah'u Dar'is-Saada, 1/94)

Likewise Hafidh stated: "one of the benefits of the anecdote of the Najran committee is: the expression of the kuffar of the mubuwwa does not enter him in Islam, until he embraces its hukm." (Fath'ul-Bari, 7/697)

Story of Heraclius is another good example of this. Although he knew that Muhammad (saw) was the prophet of Allah (awj) and moreover he showed respect to RasulAllah (saw), he did not count as one of Muslim: "Ibn An-Natur was the Governor of Ilya' (Jerusalem) and Heraclius was the head of the Christians of Sham. Ibn An-Natur narrates that once while Heraclius was visiting ilya' (Jerusalem), he got up in the morning with a sad mood. Some of his priests asked him why he was in that mood? Heraclius was a foreteller and an astrologer. He replied, 'At night when I looked at the stars, I saw that the leader of those who practice circumcision had appeared (become the conqueror). Who are they who practice circumcision?' The people replied, 'Except the Jews nobody practices circumcision, so you should not be afraid of them (Jews). 'Just Issue orders to kill every Jew present in the country.' While they were discussing it, a messenger sent by the king of Ghassan to convey the news of Allah's Apostle to Heraclius was brought in. Having heard the news, he (Heraclius) ordered the people to go and see whether the

messenger of Ghassan was circumcised. The people, after seeing him, told Heraclius that he was circumcised. Heraclius then asked him about the Arabs. The messenger replied, 'Arabs also practice circumcision.' (After hearing that) Heraclius remarked that sovereignty of the 'Arabs had appeared. Heraclius then wrote a letter to his friend in Rome who was as good as Heraclius in knowledge. Heraclius then left for Homs. (a town in Syrian and stayed there till he received the reply of his letter from his friend who agreed with him in his opinion about the emergence of the Prophet and the fact that he was a Prophet. On that Heraclius invited all the heads of the Byzantines to assemble in his palace at Homs. When they assembled, he ordered that all the doors of his palace be closed. Then he came out and said, 'O Byzantines! If success is your desire and if you seek right guidance and want your empire to remain then give a pledge of allegiance to this Prophet (i.e. embrace Islam).' (On hearing the views of Heraclius) the people ran towards the gates of the palace like onagers but found the doors closed. Heraclius realized their hatred towards Islam and when he lost the hope of their embracing Islam, he ordered that they should be brought back in audience. (When they returned) he said, 'What already said was just to test the strength of your conviction and I have seen it.' The people prostrated before him and became pleased with him, and this was the end of Heraclius's story (in connection with his faith). (Bukhari)

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) stated in Fatawa: "Surely among the narrations I stated that: Surely Islam is the deen of Allah. He had revealed His books with it; He had sent his envoys with it. It is the submission of the individual to the rabbil alemin Allah. In this state without performing shirk to Allah he will submit only to Allah. Therefore he will be distant from making others into deity and will be sound and only have made Him deity. Likewise the most virtuous of statements and basis of Islam has informed this. That is the shahadah of 'la ilaha illa Allah'. This has two meanings: Arrogance and shirk. For this reason it is narrated that Nuh (as) had commanded his children the stable of la ilaha illa Allah and Subhanallah. Besides this he had warned them of arragonce and shirk. This was mentioned in another hadith I mentioned. Surely the one who avoids ibadaah to Allah is not performing ibadaah to Him. Therefore he is not considered to have submitted to Allah. Whoever performs ibadaah to Him and another will be a mushrik. According to this he will not be considered sound. On the contrary he will be an individual of shirk." (Fatawa, 7/623)

Following is quoted from Ibn Taymiyyah (ra): "This, the tawhid uluhiyyah is the most important wajib of the ahl will and ahl tendril (leech). Whereas many who have come later had slipped from this and have deviated from the correct path. Surely what had been meant by the tawhid uluhiyyah will be understood by inclining to ones heart and taking it into consideration. In such individual the basis of things will be clearer. And in general he will have made shahadah to rububiyyah. However if in him the light of the Qur'an which establishes iman and furqan is not present that which differentiates between the ahl tawhid and ahl shirk with this opportunity those which Allah curses with His beloved, the commands of the Rasul and the restrictions will be known and in this state with the absence of tawhid uluhiyyah he will have left the fold of Islam. The reason is because the mushrik generally express the rububiyyah. The mushrik use to say regarding Allah (jj): "And most of them believe not in Allah without associating (other as partners) with Him!" (Yusuf 12/106) Surely when an individual is to make shahadah of la ilaha illa Allah and with it performs ibadaah only to Allah, in uluhiyyah, in love, in slavery to Him, inclination, submission, dua, entrusting, making wala, in enmity, in loving His loved ones, in cursing the cursed ones without associating any partners as hanif and muwahhid he will than be Muslim. With all effort if he

distances from baatil shirk as necessary and if for tawhid he uses this effort, this effort will get him closer to persistence and therefore with the statement la ilaha illa Allah verification of the rationale of uluhiyyah of Allah he will have kept distance from the uluhiyyah of others. In this sense he will have negated the deityness of others and distanced them from his heart. When this occurs only will the uluhiyyah of Allah stabilise in his heart and it will make it eternal. In a sahih hadith RasulAllah (saw) stated: "He who died knowing (fully well) that there is no god but Allah entered Paradise." (Muslim) In another hadith he stated: "Whoever's last word is la ilaha illa Allah he will go to Jannah. (Abu Dawud) Likewise in another sahih hadith he stated: "Exhort to recite" There is no god but Allah" to those of you who are dying." (Muslim, Tirmidhi, Nasai)" (Fatawa, 8/369)

When we take notice of the statements of the shaikh we can say he states: Surely when an individual makes shahadah of la ilaha illa Allah and who makes ibadaah only to Him without associating any partners to Him will then be a hanif, muwahhid; Muslim. This extensive description regarding the reality of Islam has been mentioned many times in great sources, Some of them had been previously mentioned and some of them later will be mentioned inshaAllah.

This is one of the greatest proofs that in deen there is no excuse regarding belief of tawhid which is the basis of the principal foundation and abandoning of shirk, because according to it; the mushrik are not included in the description of Islam. Likewise according to it: Hanif means the muwahhid who is on the path of basirah and sharee'ah, which has abandoned shirk. This meaning, is found plenty among the nass of the sharee'ah. Also it is certainly also understood from the statements of the mufassir.

Here is open proof and document:

c- The 'Hanif' is the one to Abandons Shirk Knowingly and Intentionally

The following is stated in the ayah: "Abraham was not a Jew nor yet a Christian; but he was true in Faith, and bowed his will to Allah's (Which is Islam), and he joined not gods with Allah." (Al-i-Imran 3/67)

Tabari stated: "Yet he was hanif" meaning he was submitted to the required obedience and commands of Allah on the right path upon the commanded hidayah. "Muslim" meaning by heart feeling humility to Allah and inclined towards him with his limbs, and an individual who obeys what had been made fard and the hukm laid down as a condition intentionally." (Tafsir)

Qurtubi stated: "Hanif is the individual who makes tawhid, who makes this apparent, who is circumsized and turns to qiblah." (Tafsir)

Ibn Kathir had interpreted it as: "He is the one who has renounced shirk and has inclined towards iman." (Tafsir)

The following ayah states: "Who can be better in religion than one who submits his whole self to Allah, does good, and follows the way of Abraham the true in Faith? For Allah did take Abraham for a friend."

(An-Nisa 4/125)

Tabari states: "As a hanif meaning righteously upon his method and path." (Tafsir)

And Ibn Kathir says: "Hanif is the one who intentionally (knowingly) turns his face from meaning with basirat abandones shirk, the one who is inclined towards Haqq with his entire body which nothing can prevent him from doing nor distance him." (Tafsir)

In the ayah it is stated: "For me, I have set my face, firmly and truly, towards Him Who created the heavens and the earth, and never shall I give partners to Allah." (Al-Anam 6/79)

Tabari stated: "Yunus explained it to me he said "Ibn Wahb informed us that Ibn Zayd, regarding what the tribe of Ibrahim had said to Ibrahim: Did you abandon worshiping these? He replied: Surely I turned my face to the Creator of samawat and ard. They said: You have not brought something new; we already are inclined towards Him and worship Him. Ibrahim said: Not as hanif, as you commit shirk, I worship (ibadaah) with ikhlas without shirk." (Tafsir)

Qurtubi stated: "As Hanif, meaning inclined towards haqq (truth)." (Tafsir)

Ibn Kathir stated: "Hanifan avoiding shirk and embracing tawhid. This is why he said next "and I am not of the idolators." (Tafsir)

In the ayah it is stated: "Abraham was indeed a model, devoutly obedient to Allah, (and) true in Faith, and he joined not gods with Allah" (an-Nahl 16/120)

Tabari stated: "Hanifan meaning upon Islam righteously." (Tafsir)

Ibn Kathir stated: "Hanif meaning because of his perfection greatness and the soundness of his tawhid and his way, We revealed to you: He was one of the idolators." (Tafsir)

In the ayah it is stated: "Being true in faith to Allah, and never assigning partners to Him: if anyone assigns partners to Allah, is as if he had fallen from heaven and been snatched up by birds, or the wind had swooped (like a bird on its prey) and thrown him into a far-distant place." (Al-Hajj 22/31)

Ibn Jarir stated: "Allah says: O mankind! Stay away from worshiping idols and statements of shirk. In a manner for Allah, with pure tawhid and distant from idols in purity making obedience and ibadaah dedicated to Him righteously." (Tafsir)

Qurtubi stated: "For Allah as a hanif, meaning righteously or inclined towards Haqq as a Muslim. Hunafa is the oposit of azdad. It means direction and inclination towards. Hunafa is mansub upon state. It has been said: Hunafaan, means hijajaan. This is only an assignment it has no proof." (Tafsir)

Ibn Kathir stated: "As Hanif for Allah meaning making it solely to Him, with the intention of haqq, and by abandoning baatil. For this reason it was interpreted "without shirk". (Tafsir)

Narrated by Ibn 'Umar: "Zaid bin 'Amr bin Nufail went to Sham, inquiring about a true religion to follow. He met a Jewish religious scholar and asked him about their religion. He said, "I intend to embrace your religion, so tell me some thing about it." The Jew said, "You will not embrace our religion unless you receive your share of Allah's Anger." Zaid said, "I do not run except from Allah's Anger, and I will never bear a bit of it if I have the power to avoid it. Can you tell me of some other religion?" He said, "I do not know any other religion except the Hanif." Zaid enquired, "What is Hanif?" He said, "Hanif is the religion of (the prophet) Abraham who was neither a Jew nor a Christian, and he used to worship None but Allah (Alone)" Then Zaid went out and met a Christian religious scholar and told him the same as before. The Christian said, "You will not embrace our religion unless you get a share of Allah's Curse." Zaid replied, "I do not run except from Allah's Curse, and I will never bear any of Allah's Curse and His Anger if I have the power to avoid them. Will you tell me of some other religion?" He replied, "I do not know any other religion except Hanif." Zaid enquired, "What is Hanif?" He replied, Hanif is the religion of (the prophet) Abraham who was neither a Jew nor a Christian and he used to worship None but Allah (Alone)" When Zaid heard their Statement about (the religion of) Abraham, he left that place, and when he came out, he raised both his hands and said, "O Allah! I make You my Witness that I am on the religion of Abraham." (Bukhari, Fath'ul-Bari, 7/176)

From the ayah of the Qur'an, the Sunnah and the narrations of the mufassir it is absolutely understood that: Hanif means with intention and basirah those who abandon shirk and abandon those other than Allah, with ikhlas the one who inclines towards making Allah the only ilah. This means distant from making shirk, and the individual righteous upon Islam.

Now can the one who abandones tawhid and dives into shirk, who associates partners in uluhiyyah to his rabb, the one who defects uluhiyyah and does not give the just rububiyyah be hanif or will he be mushrik?

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) stated: "Those deviated who do not care for the tawhid of Allah, exalt making dua to those other than Allah; the dead. When these individuals are called upon tawhid and are made aware of shirk they (do not take it serious) take it basic. Just like in the following ayah: "When the Unbelievers see thee, they treat thee not except with ridicule." Is this," (they say), "the one who talks of your gods?" and they blaspheme at the mention of (Allah) Most Gracious!" (Al-Anbiya 21/36) When the prophets had warned them against shirk they would mock them. Fundamentally the mushrik would curse to nabi and due to the great shirk within themselves they would describe them with dissoluteness, deviation and insanity. In reality when an individual which carries the characteristic of a mushrik sees an individual who calls upon tawhid you will see that due to the shirk within him he will make a mockery of him. It is said in the ayah: "Yet there are men who take (for worship) others besides Allah, as equal (with Allah): They love them as they should love Allah." (Al-Baqarah 2/165) Whoever is to love any creation like one would love Allah he is mushrik. Now there is a great difference between love for Allah and loving (alongside) with Allah. You will see that those who have turned graves into sanctuaries they will mock

the things which are only for the tawhid and ibadaah to Allah. However the same individuals will also exalt other than Allah those they have made shafaa givers to themselves. While among them one can easily take oath at ease in the name of Allah meanwhile he will not have the courage to take oath in the name of his shaikh. You will see men from various groups, according to them their (istighasa) taking refuge with their shaikh whether it is by their grave or in another place it is much beneficial than making dua to Allah at daybreak. They will ridicule those who incline towards tawhid while leaving their deviated path. While many of them destruct the masjid they build tombs and conicals. Most certainly this is due to taking lightly of Allah, His ayah and His envoy and exalting shirk. Now if these individuals are making tawaf for this and that this means this is tawaf of shirk and it is more valuable to him. This is only a resemblance to the mushrik of Mecca. Regarding them Allah (jj) had said: "Out of what Allah hath produced in abundance in tilth and in cattle, they assigned Him a share: they say, according to their fancies: "This is for Allah, and this" - for our "partners"! but the share of their" partners "reacheth not Allah, whilst the share of Allah reacheth their "partners" ! evil (and unjust) is their assignment!" (Al-Anam 6/136) They hold more valuable that which have been assigned to those other than Allah and say: Allah is rich but our deities are poor. When one of them reaches the grave he reverts, he will cry beside it, be in humility, and he will provide implore for himself which he is not able to in his daily, jumuah and night salah. This status is not the status of the muwahhid it is in reality that of a mushrik. Another example is when one among them listens to a poem of two verses (bayti ilahi) he will arrive at the humility and peace of mind he can't reach while listening to an ayah. This aside they will feel sleepy while listening to an ayah, moreover they will mock the one which recites it. Whereas because of this a great portion of this ayah falls in their borders: "Say: "Was it at Allah, and His Signs, and His Messenger, that ye were mocking?" (At-Tawbah 9/65) (Fatawa, 15/48-50)

d- For Salvation it is Necessary that Tawhid is Actualized Both by Word and Action

Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "An individual will not be a muwahhid or a mu'min even if he expresses the mustahaq attributes of his Rabb and cleanses his Rabb from everything else He is munazzah from and accepts that his Rabb is the only Creator of all. Until he makes shahadah to la ilaha illa Allah, and embraces it without shirk accepting Allah is the only mustahaq to ibadaah. Ilah is the one mustahaq (who deserves), the one worshiped and the protecting mabud." (Muwafakat'u Sahih'il-Makul li Sarih'il-Mankul bi Hamish'i Minhaj'is-Sunnah'in-Nabawiyya, 1/133)

"In summary making tawhid of Allah and believing in the envoys and the Day of Judgment alongside salih amal; one being a piece of the other they are necessities of one another. According to this, the ahl iman and ahl salih amal are of ahl saadat in the beginning and in the end. Those who have left iman are mushrik bandits. It is a reality that who ever is to deny the envoys he is only a mushrik. All mushrik are deniers of envoys. Fundamentally all mushrik and all kafir which has rejected the envoys have also rejected the Day of Judgment. Likewise in the same sense all that has rejected the Day of Judgment will also be a kafir rejecting the envoys. (Fatawa, 9/32)

"When those philosophers claimed tawhid, the tawhid they claim does not consist of ibadaah and amal it is a tawhid which consists of word (statements). Whereas in the tawhid the Rasul have brought

making deen and ibadaah particular to Allah (which has no partner and is One) is a principal. This is the truth they do not know and do not recognize. The tawhid they make claim of is the annulment of the essence of all *ism wa sifaat* (names and attributes) of Allah. There is *kufr* and deviation in this. Basically these are the greatest reasons of *shirk*. Even if they become real *muwahhid* in regards to word and *kalam* –which is a characterization of Allah (*jj*) with the attributes taught by the envoys- in this status there resides a theoretical tawhid in them remote from *amal*. This is not sufficient for salvation or happiness. On the contrary only must *ibadaah* be made to Allah and by abandoning all others He must be made the sole *Ilah*. Fundamentally this is the meaning of the expression '*la ilaha illa Allah*'. How can this be? On the contrary they are *muattil* (those who reject any attributes to Allah) in regards to word and *kalam* and not *muwahhid* and *muhlis*, only deniers... Even if those among this society have intellects and comprehension and even if they have *zuhd* and ethics, as long as they do not carry the base principals mentioned previously these mentioned individuals cannot achieve happiness or salvation from punishment. Until they choose what had been previously mentioned *iman* in Allah, Tawhid of Him, making *ibadaah* with *ikhlas* only to Him, having *iman* in the envoys and the day of judgment and until they attain *salih amal*. This faculty of view and individuals of knowledge are on the level of *deen* and *states men*. Nothing will benefit them but *ibadaah* to one and only Allah who has no partners, and having *iman* in the envoys also the Day of Judgment. Likewise these matters are necessities of one another. For example whoever performs *ibadaah* to only Allah at the same time he must have *iman* in the envoys and the last day so that he will be deserving rewards. Or else these individuals are *ahl jahannam* when the *hujjah* is established to them with an envoy they will be remaining in eternal punishment. (Fatawa. 9/35-38)

As seen salvation will only occur with three basic principals:

- a. Tawhid of Allah in *ibadaah* and in *uluhiyyah*
- b. Having *iman* in the envoys and the day of *qiyamah*
- c. *Salih amal*

If this does not happen; the individual will be of the *ahl jahannam*. However if the *nabawi hujjah* had not reached him he will not be among the *ahl* of eternal *jahannam* on the Day of Judgment. This had previously been explained; surely only the Muslim will enter *jannah*.

Islam is the oneness of Allah regarding tawhid and *uluhiyyah* and the rejection of all those *ibadaah* made to other than Allah whoever has not accomplished (believed in) as much will surely be among the *mushrik*. For this reason there is no excuse sourcing from *jahl* (ignorance) or *ta'weel*. However the one which the *nabawi hujjah* has not reached will only be punished in *darayn* (both *dunya* and *akhirah*) only after the *nabawi hujjah* has been established. (With this he will not be considered Muslim or this will not necessitate him being Muslim.)

Ibn Taymiyyah (r) stated: "Fundamentally justice by making *deen* particular to Him is absolute *waajib* by

all means in all sharee'ah. It is essential that the individual performs pure/ sincere ibadaah only to Him and makes dua only to Him. This will not be lifted from the individual in any situation. Let alone only will the ahl tawhid enter jannah. They are ahl la ilaha illa Allah. Basically this is the right of Allah upon each of His servants. Likewise in the event of Mu'adh narrated in the sahihayn Rasulallah (saw) states: "It is narrated on the authority of Mu'adh b. Jabal (ra) that Rasulallah (saw) said: Mu'adh, do you know the right of Allah over His bondsmen? He (Mu'adh) said: Allah and His Apostle know best. He (saw) said: That Allah alone should be worshipped and nothing should be associated with Him. He (saw) said: What rights have they (bondsmen) upon Him in case they do it? He (Mu'adh) said: Allah and His Apostle know best. He (saw) said: That He would not punish them." (Bukhari & Muslim) However those who make deen, ibadaah and dua purely to Allah will be saved. The individual which does not make his deen directed to Him will not be saved from the punishment of Allah. And whoever does not perform ibadaah to him along with not performing shirk; this individual will have stayed behind from performing ibadaah to Him and any other. Just like faraun and his likes. Fundamentally in this state he is worse than a mushrik. For this reason it is necessary to worship only Allah. This is a necessary wajib for each individual. With no means will it be lifted from anyone. Fundamentally this is general Islam which Allah accepts no other as deen. However Allah will not punish anyone without sending an envoy to them. Likewise, as He will not punish; no other but the Muslim/mu'min can enter jannah. In this sense neither mushrik nor those who keep distant from worshipping their Rabb can enter it. Whoever dawah has not reached in this dunya will be tested in the akhirah. Likewise only will those who submit to shaytan will enter jahannam. Whoever has not sinned will not enter jahannam because prior to sending an envoy Allah will not punish anyone with jahannam. Whoever the message of an envoy has not reached for instance a child, insane and an individual who dies as ahl fatrah. These individuals will be tested in the akhirah just as the narrations reinforce this. (Fatawa, 14/476-477)

By the expressions of the shaikh we understand the following from the matter. Surely salvation in the akhirah is only for those who actualize the following three things:

a- Tawhid of Allah

b- Iman in the envoys and the Day of Judgment

c- Salih amal

In the ayah it is stated: "If anyone desires a religion other than Islam (submission to Allah), never will it be accepted of him; and in the Hereafter He will be in the ranks of those who have lost (All spiritual good)." (Al-i Imran 3/85) The following is narrated in a hadith: "No one but a believing person would enter Paradise." (Muslim)

According to this whoever does not come to tawhid and joins in shirk is a mushrik. For passing this hukm of mushrik in dunya there will be no excuse because this individual will have invalidated the fitrah, misak and hujjah of 'aql. However upon this individual, the attribute of kafir which necessitates punishment in dunya/ akhirah will not be stabilised until hujjah is established; even if he performs an act which

necessitates punishment. This is from the rahmah and fadl of Allah.

Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "Surely the envoys have been sent to invite only to Allah. They have explained the life of the akhirah both concisely and in detail. The narrations explain this in different forms both short and in length. Uluhiyyah is the essence of all this. In this sense it must only be explained what it means to worship Him (awj) rather than those other than Him. The nabi who have come with this aim the three principals have perpetuated: a- Iman of Allah b- Iman in the Day of Judgment c- Salih amal" (Fatawa, 17/125-126)

"The philosophers, ahl kalam and nomitive (ahl law) who have made the rules according to matters and subjects and have subsequently claim an individual can only enter Islam with these and the basis of deen (asluddeen) can only actualize with them.

When Ibn Taymiyyah mentions individuals as such he states: "These individuals imitate the taghout and stated: anything established without this path of qiyas will not express 'ilm. This is not possible for many. One of them is that which is attained with waajib iman. When it is like this the mentioned individual will be kafir, zindeeq, munafiq, jahl, deviant, deviator, zalim, kafur (the one who hides haqq). Likewise he will be from among the enemies of the rasul and among the munafiq of the society. Regarding individuals as such Allah (jj) has stated: "Thus have We made for every prophet an enemy among the sinners: but enough is thy Lord to guide and to help." (Al-Furqan 25/31) In some individuals both iman and nifaq are produced together. This way they become murtad. This is either from the asluddeen or the fundamentals of deen. This riddad is the riddad of nifaq or the irtidad of kufr. This is as a fact of plenty and general. Especially in places where ignorance, nifaq and kufr are widespread it is much more. It is not possible to explain here the strange ignorance, zulm, kizb, kufr, nifaq and evil in them. Even in hidden matters it could be said that he is mistaken in this matter and is in deviation. However the hujjah which takfir is established upon its owner has not been established yet. When it is like this, this strangeness even appears in some of their groups among all and particular; which all Muslim know are open and dhahir matters of Islam. Moreover the Jewish, Christians and mushrik all know Muhammad had brought this. Those who deny this are made takfir of. For instance his command of worshipping Allah without shirk and his restriction of those other than Allah for example, angels, envoys etc. Surely these are among the most clear and dhahir signs of Islam. Again matters such as enmity to the Jewish, the Christian and the mushrik, fornication, riba, alcohol, gambling; all being haraam etc. Later you will see most of their leaders have fallen in this filth. And in this state they have become murtad even if some make tawba and convert like some other tribe leaders. For example like al Akra, Uyayna and other groups which have made irtidad from Islam. These have later on converted back. Some of them had been accused with discord and illness in their hearts and some are not in this state. Fundamentally most of the leaders o those individuals are like this. You will see that sometimes they will openly be murtad with open irtidad from Islam and sometimes you will see they return to it; Of coarse with the illness and discord in (remaining) their hearts. This is a third state for them. In this state iman is victorious over discord. However once again it is rare that they are cleansed from the types of discord. The narrations regarding this matter are very famous. The following is much clear: Some among them have classified books regarding the mushrik deen and irtidad from Islam. For example Razi had

classified a book regarding ibadaah to the stars and has provided evidences to the (so called) beauty and benefits of this and has encouraged mankind to this. This with the ittifaq of all Muslim is irtidad from Islam; even if he had returned to Islam later on. Essentially none of those things such as 'ilm, amal and ethics which they have commanded will be sufficient to save one from the punishment of Allah; let alone them leading to the blessings of akhirah. Allah (jj) stated: "Who is more unjust than one who invents a lie against Allah or rejects His Signs? For such, their portion appointed must reach them from the Book (of decrees)" (Al-Araf 7/37) "For when their messengers came to them with Clear Signs, they exulted in such knowledge (and skill) as they had; but that very (Wrath) at which they were wont to scoff hemmed them in. But when they saw Our Punishment, they said: "We believe in Allah,- the one Allah - and we reject the partners we used to join with Him." But their professing the Faith when they (actually) saw Our Punishment was not going to profit them. (Such has been) Allah's Way of dealing with His Servants (from the most ancient times). And even thus did the Rejecters of Allah perish (utterly)!" (Al-Ghafir 40/83-85) Here the similar informed in A'raf has been informed. Those who have turned their faces from the Rasul when the severe punishment of Allah comes they had made tawhid of Allah and abandoned shirk. This had not benefited them. Just like what had been informed regarding firaun. He would deny tawhid and risalah however "At length, when overwhelmed with the flood, he said: "I believe that there is no god except Him Whom the Children of Israel believe in: I am of those who submit (to Allah in Islam)." (Yunus 10/90) Also in the following two ayah it is stated: "When thy Lord drew forth from the Children of Adam - from their loins - their descendants, and made them testify concerning themselves... (This), lest ye should say on the Day of Judgment." (Al-Araf 172) Ayahs as such are found in many parts of the Qur'an. They inform that The Rasul have commanded to worship only Allah without shirk and warned them to beware of ibadaah to those other than Allah. Also surely the ahl saadat (happiness) is the ahl tawhid and the mushrik are the ahl brigandage. Likewise it is informed that those who do not have iman in the prophets are mushrik. As understood from this tawhid and iman in the envoys necessitated one another. Just as iman in akhirah. All three of these matters are necessities of one another which can not be separated. For this reason they have been united just like in the following ayah: "Nor follow thou the vain desires of such as treat our signs as falsehoods, and such as believe not in the Hereafter: for they hold others as equal with their Guardian-Lord." (Al-Anam 6/150) Surely it is understood that the reality of happiness and the reason of salvation from punishment is ibadaah only to Allah without shirk and tawhid of Allah, iman in the envoys and the Day of Judgment also salih amal. These matters are not among the hikmah of those mentioned individuals. Yes the commands of ibadaah only to Allah without shirk and the restriction of ibadaah to the created is not among their agenda of hikmah. On the contrary all shirk in this alam have occurred from them and their likes. They have commanded shirk and have acted upon it. Now those among them who does not command shirk however does not restrict it but is accepting both of them for instance in anyway even if they choose the muwahhid at the same time they will choose the mushrik alongside. Individuals as such will have abandoned both situations at the same time. Think about this point well; this is a very important matter. Surely I have seen in their books ibadaah to the stars and angels alongside inclusive ibadaah to the nafs much other than the envoys and others and the things which are in essence of shirk. When these individuals claim tawhid surely this tawhid of theirs is only a tawhid of word without ibadaah and without amal. Whereas absolutely the tawhid the envoys have brought consists of the following: Deen being halis (purely) to Allah and the principal of performing ibadaah only to Him. This is

something they do not understand at all. The tawhid they claim invalidates the reality of 'ism and sifaat. In addition there is the existence of the most important cause of kufr/shirk which is deviation." (Fatawa, 18/53-58)

From the quotations from Shayh ul Islam the following can be summarised:

1. Tawhid is a necessity in the actualization of Islam. The Islam of an individual will not be sahih without it.
2. Until the mushrik enters Islam he is indigent to learn tawhid.
3. The mushrik is a bid'ah doer in deen and performs shirk to his rabb. He follows a path other than the path of the mu'min.
4. Islam means to submit to only Allah. Whoever is worshipping another alongside Allah will not be considered Muslim. The mustakbir who escapes from worshipping Allah is like this also
5. Surely without performing its necessities (submitting) sole expression does not mean becoming Islam (Muslim). Islam is expression alongside obedience. This is a matter ittifaq has been made over by the sahabah, tabi'een and the imams of Sunnah.
6. Tawhid uluhiyyah is the basic separation of ahl tawhid and ahl shirk. Surely the servant will become a hanif, muwahhid Muslim when he makes tawhid of Allah in uluhiyyah knowingly, intentionally with basirah, abandons shirk and excludes others.
7. Only will those who make tawhid, in dhahir and batin has iman in the Day of Judgment and with salih amal will be saved from the punishment of Allah. The mushrik will surely be punished after hujjah has been established to them. Likewise they will not be blessed until hujjah has been established because only the Muslim Mu'min individual will enter jannah.
8. All prophets have explained in detail to worship Allah without shirk because this is the principal of principals.

Ibn Qayyim stated: "Islam is tawhid of Allah and without shirk making ibadaah solely to Him also iman in Allah and His Rasul and obedience in the matters he has brought. The servant who is not like this is not a Muslim. Even if this individual is not a stubborn Kafir he is an ignorant kafir." (Tariq ul Hijratayn, 411)

Muhammad Ibn Abdulwahhab stated: "Know that the tawhid from beginning to the end invited to, by the envoys, is the tawhid of Allah in all ibadaah. No angel nor any sent envoy does not have the right of this. Those other than these have none at all. In this frame dua will only be made to Him. The following is stated in the ayah: "And the places of worship are for Allah (alone): So invoke not any one along with Allah" (al-Jinn 72/18) According to this whoever performs ibadaah to Allah day and night and directs his

dua to a prophet or an awliyah whose grave he has visited will surely mean he has attained two deities. Essentially this individual will not have made shahadah that there is no god but Allah. The reason is because his ilah (deity) has become that which he has called (made dua to). Just like what today's mushrik does when at the graves of Zubayr, Abdulqadir etc. Whoever slaughters a thousand sacrificial animals and slaughters only one for a nabi or another he will have attained two deities. As mentioned in the ayah: "Say: Truly, my prayer and my service of sacrifice, my life and my death, are (all) for Allah, the Cherisher of the Worlds" (Al-Anam 6/162) Nusk is the slaughtering of an animal. Now in comparison to this whoever makes all ibadaah halis (genuine) to Allah and does not associate any partners to Him this would mean this individual is the one to make shahadah of la ilaha illa Allah. Whoever adds another to this ibadaah besides Allah is an individual who is mushrik and who denies la ilaha illa Allah. These shirk I have mentioned are found in everyone from east to west, except for the estranged mentioned in the hadith. (What a tiny amount of them there is.) (Kutub Sitta 17/530) Regarding this matter, among all the madhhab scholars there is no difference." (Ar Risalat ul 'Ishruun from the book Ar Risail us Shasiyya, 166-167)

"Know that this kalimat is the alamat il fariqa which separates Islam and kufr. That is the word of taqwa which is urwat il wuska. This is what Ibrahim (as) had exhibited: "And he left it as a Word to endure among those who came after him, that they may turn back (to Allah)." (Az-Zukhruf 43/28) What is meant by this is not stating this without the knowledge of what it means. The munafiq state this. When it is like this they are at the bottom of jahannam, under the kafir; even though they performed salah and gave charity. On the contrary what had been meant by this is, knowing it by heart (acknowledging it) and expressing kalimah tawhid and everything related to it with love. Likewise it is hatred and enmity to those which oppose it. Likewise RasulAllah (saw) stated: "Whoever states there is no other deity but Allah with ikhlas" in this narration; "the ikhlas which comes from the heart" in another; "confirming by heart" and in another "whoever says la ilaha illa Allah and rejects all those worshipped other than Allah". And other hadith which shows the ignorance of people to shahadah..." (Tarikh ul Najd, 397)

Baghawi had stated in tafsir of the following ayah: "Our Lord! make of us Muslims (submissive unto Thee)" (al-Baqarah 2/128) "Meaning obeying as a muwahhid and by showing you humility." (Tafsir)

Ibn Kathir narrating from Ibn Jarir stated: "What is meant by dua is the following: Make us those who submit to and obey to your commands. It means in obedience and ibadaah we will not associate any other to You. (Tafsir)

Regarding the following ayah Qurtubi stated: "The Religion before Allah is Islam (submission to His Will)" (al-e Imran 3/19) "The religion (deen) in this ayah is obedience and nations. Islam is in the meaning of iman and obedience. Abu'l Aliya had mentioned this. Also most of the mutakallim have the same view." (Tafsir)

Baghawi stated: "Islam is entering peace. This is submission (inqiyad) and obedience. For example it will be said he submitted (became Islam). This means he has entered peace and submitted. Regarding the following ayah Qatadah stated: "The Religion before Allah is Islam (submission to His Will)" (Al-i Imran

3/19): “The shahadah of la ilaha illa Allah and the statement of those sent from Allah, is the deen Allah has made a sharee'ah. He had sent His envoys with it and had encouraged His wali to it. He will not accept any other but it and will only make responsible for it.” (Tafsir)

Ibn Kathir stated: “Truly, the religion with Allah is Islam. Allah states that there is no religion accepted with Him from any person, except Islam. Islam includes obeying all of the Messengers until Muhammad (saw) who finalized their commission, thus closing all paths to Allah except through Muhammad. Therefore, after Allah sent Muhammad, whoever meets Allah following a path other than Muhammad's, it will not be accepted of him. In another Ayah, Allah said, “And whoever seeks a religion other than Islam, it will never be accepted of him.” (al-e Imran 3/85) (Tafsir)

From the ayah from the Qur'an and nabawi nass also the approach of the salafy saliheen -with the permission and blessing of Allah- we understand the following:

Surely that which Allah had commanded us to make our deen, and commanded us to fight for the sake of until mankind accepts is; Islam. Contrary to all other deen this is the deen Allah has consent over, and the salvation of entering jannah and being saved from eternal jahannam belonging only to its members; the deen is Islam. This means tawhid of Allah in deity, obedience and ibadaah, in batin and dhahir without associating any partners, submitting and obeying Him alongside rejecting all that is worshiped besides Him. Also it is not prior to itikad and iman uttering only the kalimah shahadah. Likewise abstracting from shirk, inclining towards tawhid, being hanif and accepting all the hukm of Islam; meaning it will not be actualized without the compulsion of accepting only from Allah being under consideration.

Inna lillah wa inna 'ilayhi raji'un.

e- Accepting Ahkam from those other than Allah is Shirk in Both Uluhiyyah and Rububiyyah

The following ayah points us in this direction; “But if ye obey them, ye will be in truth polytheists.” (Al-Anam 6/121)

Tabari interprets this ayah in the following manner: “His word “...ye will be polytheists” meaning in that case you will be like them because they eat the flesh of the dead accounting it to be halaal. If like them, you eat the flesh of the dead you will be mushrik like them.” (Tafsir)

Qurtubi stated: “The ayah means that the one which makes halaal of that which Allah had made haraam, will be accounted mushrik. In this sense Allah had made haraam the flesh of the dead. When it is like this if one accepts it to be halaal, then without doubt he will have performed shirk. Ibn Arabi stated: Surely the mu'min will become mushrik when he obeys the mushrik in itikad. When he obeys him in action but is still upon tawhid and attesting to the truth in this case he will be a rebel. This must be known as such.” (Tafsir)

Ibn Kathir stated: "The statement of Allah "But if ye obey them, ye will be in truth polytheists." (Al-Anam 6/121) meaning it is like turning to another; other than the commands and sharee'ah of Allah. This is shirk (and you will become mushrik). Likewise it is stated in the ayah: "They take their priests and their anchorites to be their lords in derogation of Allah, and (they take as their Lord) Christ the son of Mary" (at-Tawbah 9/31)" (Tafsir)

As known, shirk is taking on other deities alongside Allah. According to this, what is meant in the ayah is the acceptance of any hukm other than the hukm of Allah and by this the doer becomes mushrik. In this situation the acceptance of the hukm of another, other than the hukm of Allah in any matter, means shirk in uluhiyyah of Allah; because ilah is the one that is not rebelled against and the one that is obeyed. Within this frame it is necessary that Rabb taala is made tawhid of in obedience, acceptance and walayah.

In the following ayah it is stated: "Follow (O men!) the revelation (Qur'an) given unto you from your Lord, and follow not, as friends or protectors, other than Him. Little it is ye remember of admonition." (Al-Araf 7/3)

Baghawi stated: "meaning other than Him do not befriend those you will obey to rebel Allah."

Qurtubi stated: "secondly... Do not worship Him with another. Do not befriend anyone who has turned his back to the deen of Allah. Surely whoever is pleased with an environment (group/madhab) this will mean the members of that environment are his wali." (Tafsir)

Ibn Kathir stated: "Follow (O men!) the revelation (Qur'an) given unto you from your Lord" meaning be content with and go after what had come to you with a book by the ummi Prophet from the Rabb and Malik of all (everything). "And follow not, as friends or protectors, other than Him. Little it is ye remember of admonition." (Al-Araf 7/3) This means do not go out of the lines of what the Rasul has brought you. Or else you will have returned to the hukm that is hukm other than the hukm of Allah." (Tafsir)

Fundamentally what had been meant by obedience and acceptance of hukm is this; it means the belief that hakimiyyah and legislation of Allah is valid upon everyone and accepts it to be general. Allah (jj) will command and there is none which can change His hukm. Everyone who has made kalimah shahadah will be accepted to have accepted all the hukm in this manner.

La hawla wala quwwata illa billah

1- Attesting to the Truth and Obedience are among the Elements of Iman

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) stated: "This is such a matter which many among the khalaf have mistaken over. It is thought that iman in reality is only attesting to the truth. Then they will see the one which has not lied or the one which has lied not by heart only but also by tongue and see individuals like Pharaoh and Iblis

whose kufr is most obscene and therefore are surprised. Fundamentally if they had found the sirati mustaqim the selefi salihin had been upon; they would have known iman consisted of word and action; meaning in reality by word of heart and action of heart. Surely iman is within the borders of the kalam of Allah and risalah. His kalam and risalah includes His message and commands. In this situation the heart will attest to the message, an attestation in the heart such that the necessities are placed in the heart immediately. Attestation is a type of 'ilm and word. His commands will be obeyed and submitted to. This obedience and submission (istislam) is a type of amal and irada. An individual will not be Mu'min unless he actualizes both of these. Whenever he abandons obedience he will be mustakbir and even if he attests to this he will be kafir. Fundamentally kufr is more general than takzib (denial). Kufr can sometimes be a denial of ignorance. Sometimes it could be the kufr of istikbar (arrogance) and zulm (oppression). For this reason Iblis had been characterized with kufr and kibr rather than denial/lying (takzib). For this reason the kufr of the Jewish and likes are among the types of the kufr of Iblis. However the kufr of the Nasara (Christians) and those alike in deviation, is of ignorance. As known a group from among the Jewish came to the Nabi (saw) and asked him questions and he answered. They said we make shahadah that you are Nabi. However they did not submit to him. The situation of Hiraql and the others is the same. This message and submission did not benefit them. As seen whoever attests to the matters the Rasul had brought and stated: what he has brought is the risalah of Allah, it includes 'ilm, commands and restrictions, this individual will need to attain a second stage. This stage is the attestation of the message of Allah and obedience to the mentioned commands. When the individual states: 'I make shahadah there is no other deity worthy of ibadaah but Allah' this shahadah will include the attestation of messages of Allah and the obedience to the commands of Allah. On the other hand the shahadah of 'I make shahadah that Muhammad is his envoy' necessitates the attestation of what the Rasul had brought from Allah. With the unity of both of these shahadah the word will be completed. For both these shahadah if attestation had been sufficient the one who accepts it will be like the one who believes the essence of iman consists only of this however is unwary of the rest. Whereas in it; obedience must be present. If it is not, in this case in dhahir and in batin attesting to the Rasul but avoiding submission to the commands will be in consideration. The attestation of the individual as such is like the one who only hears the risalah of Allah. Just like Iblis. This means the following: Surely mockery of Allah and His Rasul will invalidate submission to Him. The reason for this is that the command of obedience to the Rasul has reached us from Allah (jj). According to this, obedience will have become like attesting to the messages he had brought. In this sense whoever does not obey the commands, will be denying him or is avoiding obeying his Rabb. The second of these is an open kufr. Whoever is belittling him or is mocking by heart, this situation will prevent him from obedience to his commands. Surely obedience is respect and exalting. Belittling is betrayal and seeing despicable. Both of these are things opposite of one another. Whenever one of these takes place in the heart the other will come to an end. As known, betrayal and seeing despicable will invalidate iman in the heart. Like an opposite invalidating its opposite." (As-sarimu'l-Maslul 458-459)

2- Not Accepting the Hukm from Allah is Kufr without Ikhtilaf

Ibn Taymiyyah continues: "Thirdly...: Surely if the servant sins believing it has been made haraam to him by Allah and knows it is a necessity to obey Allah, he will not become kafir with this act. However

although the act is haraam if he believes Allah has not made this haraam or accepts He (jj) had made it haraam along with avoiding the acceptance of this and turns his face from obeying Allah and bowing; this individual is either a denier or a muannid (an individual who rejects stubbornly). For this reason it has been said that with istikbar (arrogance) if an individual rebels Allah, with ittifaq he will be kafir. Whoever rebels due to desire (sins) according to the ahl Sunnah wal jamaa'ah he will not be kafir. The Khawaarij make takfir of these individuals. Surely the mustakbir rebel (sinner) who turns his face from ibadaah in arrogance, even if he is attesting that Allah is his Rabb his stubbornness and defying will invalidate the mentioned attestation. The explanation of this is that whoever performs a haraam believing it to be halaal is a kafir with ittifaq. Surely the one to account the haraam in the Qur'an as halaal will not have believed in it; if he accounts it even without acting upon it. Seeing it halaal will mean not believing Allah had made it haraam. Now this can be in the way of not believing Allah had made it haraam. This will corrupt the iman in rububiyyah and iman in risalah. This is pure denial without being related to any introduction. Also he knows Allah had made this haraam, likewise he knows that which Allah makes haraam the Rasul makes haraam also and then he avoids embracing these and obeying it and dives into these haraam. This situation is a kufr advanced than the prior. This will sometimes occur when it is known the one who does not act upon the mentioned haraam will be punished by Allah. Later surely this avoidance and turning of ones face, either sources from the hikmah of the one who commanded and out of the corruptive belief of having sufficient strength. Even this means not attesting to an attribute among His attributes. Sometimes it will be along with knowing everything he has attested to. This can be either from force of habit or of the desires of the nafs. This in reality is kufr for the following reason: because he knows Allah and expresses it, he accepts all that the rasul has informed likewise attests to all that the mu'min attests to but he is not pleased with this, he has enmity to it and because it does not suit his desires and pleasure he is angered with it. And he states: 'I do not state this and I do not actualise its necessities. I have enmity to this haqq and I hate it.' This is not of the first type making takfir of him is a matter essentially known in the deen of Islam. The Qur'an is filled with this takfir approach. Moreover the end of these individuals is much severe. It has been said regarding the punishment of such: "On the day of judgment the most severe punishment is for the alim who did not benefit with the 'ilm of Allah." This is Iblis and those who follow his path. Here the difference between him and the rebel is openly exposed. Surely this one believes he must perform this act, in fact it is wajib for him to do so. However desire and hatred had prevented him from performing them. With this he is the owner of iman which is comprised of attestation, humility and obedience. This is expression; however it is an expression which its action has not been completed." (As Sarim ul Maslul 458-459)

In this valuable narration biithnillah and the rahmah of Allah there are many lessons and is full of benefits. To understand its meaning and benefits correctly it must be carefully and thoroughly read.

As seen here the expression of kalimah shahadah comprises attestation and obedience. The reason is because this expression means the acceptance of the hukm or the attestation that includes obedience.

What we understand from the words of Sheikhu'l-Islam is: Surely in hukm stumbling and confusion is due to not comprehending the reality of iman; whereas this is the touchstone of the hukm. If this is not understood it will lead to fitnah and collapse in hukm. This matter is among the important matters

regarding the comprehension of the ahkam. Likewise for this reason the ulamaa had insisted on clarifying the following:

The one who does not have iman does not have Islam and the one that does not have Islam does not have iman.

5- The principles of Iman and its outline

a- Iman and Islam Necessitate One Another

Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Abi Shayba have said: "In no circumstance will there be iman without Islam nor will there be Islam without iman. (Fatawa 7/329)

Narrating from Ibn AbdilBarr Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "The relationship between Islam and iman in meaning and hukm is the relationship of the shahadatayn upon one another. For example making shahadah to the Rasul (Muhammad (saw)) does not mean making shahadah to wahdaniyyah (la ilaha illa Alah- that Allah is one). In reality both of these are two separate issues. However in meaning and hukm they are inseparable from one another. Likewise iman and Islam like they are the same of one another one tightly embraces the other. As the one without iman will not have Islam; the one without Islam will not have iman. The Muslim is obligated to have an iman which Islam will be sahih with and the mu'min is obligated with an Islam which materializes iman. The reason for this is because Allah (jj) had laid down iman for salih amal and for salih amal iman as a condition. "Whoever works any act of righteousness and has faith,-His endeavour will not be rejected: We shall record it in his favour." (Al-Anbiya 21/94) And regarding iman materializing with amal it is stated in the ayah: "But such as come to Him as Believers who have worked righteous deeds,- for them are ranks exalted." (Ta-Ha 20/75) According to this whoever has an outside appearance (dhahir) of Islam and if this is not sourced from iman of gayb (inside) this individual will be munafiq with this nifaq that extracts him from deen. The one whose treaty sources from his iman in gayb but is not acting upon iman and Islam this individual is kafir with the kufr that tawhid has not been established. The one who has iman (mu'min) in that which the rasul has brought, and lives acting upon (actualizing) the commands of Allah, is a mu'min Muslim. If it is not as such it would not be permissible to name as Mu'min Muslim. Likewise the Muslim should not have been named the mu'min who has believed in Allah. Whereas the ahl qiblah had made ijma that all mu'min are muslim and all Muslim are mu'min who believes in Allah, the angels and the books." (Fatawa 7/333)

Ibn Rajab stated: "The difference between Islam and Iman is that Iman is the belief, confession, and knowledge of heart. Islam however is the submission of the slave of Allah (awj) as well as his humility and surrender to Allah (swt). Thus Islam is action (as opposed to belief and knowledge). It is this (Islam) action which Allah (swt) has labeled as the religion "deen"..." Surely without debate it is the principal kalimah shahadah. Of course in the state that these are uttered and are attested to. As known attesting to these are among the conditions of Islam. In the following ayah some among the ulamaa which Muhammad b. Jafar b. az Zubayr had been among had made tafsir of it with tawhid and attestation: "The Religion before Allah is Islam (submission to His Will)' (al-e Imran 3/19) When some ones Islam is

accepted but iman is considered invalid for example the Arabi Allah had informed of (Hujurat 49/14) surely the existence of the muhkam (firm) iman in the heart is invalidated however with an iman that will validate an amal and participation in the dhahir amal of Islam is accepted. If they hadn't had this much iman in this case they would not have been Muslim." (Jami'ul Ulum wa'l Hikma)

As seen the statements of the ulama support one another. It informs that in order to have Islam it is necessary to have an iman which will make it sahih. In this sense iman will not be established unless there is the dhahir Islam which informs it. Fundamentally, this matter is important as we can see that the statements of the ulama are in this direction.

Surely the utterance of the kalimah shahdah necessitates for its owner to pass hukm with Islam. Let alone this is a right and a situation distant from doubt. However this utterance has a few conditions. This is the existence of an iman which will give a meaning to the dhahir Islam. Likewise the ulama inform the following: We do not command to split people and to look inside of them, we do not want to be informed of what is inside. On the contrary what we want is they are treated according to their dhahir. The aim is so that the existence of iman in the individual who utters it or the corrupted itikad can be assumed. Whenever something that is incompatible with the hukm of sharee'ah comes out, if this necessitates the corruption and invalidity of iman the probability of the presence of the sahih iman will be absolutely believed to be vanished and it will be necessary to give him the hukm of irtidad.

As Ibn Taymiyyah had stated "Unless it is not proven that the inside is the opposite of this (the outward appearance); the dhahir (outward appearance) is sahih and trustworthy evidence. Whenever evidence is provided regarding what is inside and it is understood that the batin (inside) is the opposite of the dhahir then the dhahir will not be regarded." (As Sarim'ul Maslul, 301)

1- Avoiding Shirk and Embracing the Ahkam is the Right of 'la ilaha illa Allah'

This is giving hukm according to the dhahir. Biithnillah and Karamullah we understand here that the open nass and the evidence of the statements of the ahl 'ilm the aim of the fight is to abstract from shirk, distancing from taghout and without shirk tawhid of Allah in uluhiyyah and obedience. This is what the clear nass presented and the narrations of the ahl 'ilm regarding this important matter put forth.

Surely Allah had revealed books, sent envoys, created the entire universe and had made akhirah the primary matter so that He (jj) is worshiped without shirk. Also with the condition of obedience, He (jj) is bowed in the same sense all other but He (jj) is rejected in obedience. Nevertheless all this are done with the heart and limbs. As evidence of the itikad in heart Allah had taken as essential the dhahir utterance of the shahadatayn. Only in this situation will the fight be lifted (stopped) and that is except for the necessities of kalimat tawhid in rights and rules. It is known in certainty that surely tawhid of Allah in ibadaah is the right of 'la ilaha illa Allah. Whenever the contrary appears in the individual who utters to carry out its aim fight (war) will come in session once again.

If perchance it was requested that the shadatayn was only utterance, without cleansing from shirk and if

it was sufficient without the avoidance of worship in all its types to those other than Allah than why did RasulAllah (saw) state illa bi haqqiha (the right of it –kalimah shahada-). If the right of it had been only to utter it in this case all that utters the shahadatayn would have had given its (shahadatayn) right. It would be meaningless to mention the condition of illa bi haqqiha. This would not have any hukm nor would it have a reality that is valuable, wal iyadhu billah.

We reject this approach with the expression of RasulAllah (saw) Let alone the individual who claims this must verify the Islam and iman of the munafiq. The reason is because he utters the kalimah shahadah which according to him is the only right of it; even though there are evidences of his nifaq in the dahir. For instance even if he curses Allah, His books, and His nabi if he befriends the kuffar, distances from the Muslim, and is trialed (muhakama) to those other than Allah. Even if he rejects the hakimiyah of Allah, rejoices to the defeat of the Muslim and is distressed by the defeat of the mushrik.

2- Whoever believes that it is Permissible to Abandon the Submission to the sharee'ah will be Kafir

Ibn Taymiyyah stated: “Those who claim the individual who expresses the kalimat shahadah, will enter jannah without actualizing the fard and keeping distant from its restrictions and no one in this state will be punished with fire; he is a murtad kafir. This individual must be requested to make tawbah. If he makes tawbah than okay but if he does not he will be killed. On the contrary those who utter the shahadatayn will be separated into groups. Among them the munafiq are in the deepest of fire.” (Fatawa 35/106)

Ibn Taymiyyah narrated Ahmad ibn Hanbal said: “Humaydi informed us: I was informed people were saying: If an individual utters (believes) in salah, zakah, observing fast, hajj and till the day he dies he does not perform any of these moreover even if he performs salah turning his back to the qiblah, as long as this person is not a denier he is still mu'min. Provided that when he abandons these it is known he has iman within and he accepts the fard and the istikbal qiblah. Upon this is said: This openly is kufr. This is the opposite of the book of Allah the Sunnah of His Rasul and the statements of the ulamaa of Islam. It is stated in the ayah: “And they have been commanded no more than this: To worship Allah, offering Him sincere devotion, being true (in faith).” (al-Bayyinah 98/5) I heard Abu Abdullah Ahmad b. Hanbal state: Whos ever states this surely he will have made kufr (denied) to Allah. Likewise he will have rejected His commands and that which His envoys have brought from Allah.” (Fatawa 7/209)

Ibn Taymiyyah stated Ahmad b. Hanbal said: “Khalaf ibn Hayyan told us that Ma'kil ibn Ubaydullah Al Abasi narrated: Salim al Aftas came to us with the irca (murjiah) belief. Maymun b. Mahran and Abdulkarim b. Malik had been among us and had intensely hated this. He requested from Allah that he is not left with him anywhere. Ma'kil said: Upon this I debated with him and went to Ata b. Abi Rabah with my friend. At that time he was reciting Yusuf 12/110. I said to him we have a problem can you spare us some time. And he did. I informed him and said: A tribe before us had innovated somethings. They say: Surely salah and zakah are not from deen. He said does not Allah say: “And they have been commanded no more than this: To worship Allah, offering Him sincere devotion, being true (in faith -Muslim); to establish regular prayer; and to practise regular charity; and that is the Religion Right and Straight.” (al-

Bayyina 98/5) As seen salah and zakah is from deen. Upon this I said: Surely they say these are extra and they are not from deen. He said did not Allah say: "that they may add faith to their faith" (al-Fath 48/4) This is from iman. I said to him when it is like this they attribute this to you and say they are with you on this. In this sense the following news came to me: Ibn Zarr with a group of friend's came to you and told you this. You accepted this and said these words. Upon this he said. Wallahi no I take oath upon the one which there is no other deity of, no. He repeated these two or three times. And continued saying: I came to Madinah and sat beside Nafi I said: O Abu Abdullah I have a problem I'd like to discuss with you. He said is this secret or is it open. I said it is not open it is (private) secret. When I said this he said: There are many secrets which do not contain any khayr. I said: Not that kind. After we prayed asr he got up, held my dress and we left and without waiting too long he asked what is your problem. I said: distant that other man. He sent him away and I told him his words. Upon this he narrated the hadith of RasulAllah (saw): I have been directed to fight against people so long as they do not say: There is no god but Allah, and he who professed it was granted full protection of his property and life on my behalf except for a right? I said to him they say that we will utter that salah is fard but we will not perform salah. We will say alcohol is haraam but we will drink it. It is haraam to marry mothers but we will marry them. When I told him this he let his hand go and said: who ever does this is kafir." (Fatawa, 7/204-205)

3- The right of 'la ilaha illa Allah'

The right of 'la ilaha illa Allah' is as follows: The rejection/kufr of all that is worshiped other than Allah and the embrace the principals of Islam. Likewise as mentioned previously the ulamaa of Islam have recorded that: 'The one who has no iman has no Islam.' When the servant expresses the shahadatayn it will be supposed that there is iman present inside and that he actualized its necessities. Whenever there is evidence in the dhahir that in the batin the iman has been invalidated we will pass the hukm that he had invalidated his shahadatayn. This is hukm given according to the dhahir.

Walhamdulillah, all praise is to Allah (swt) Whom He Guides is truly guided. Whom He leaves astray will not find guidance. There is no might nor power except from Allah.

b- 'Ilm and Amal are both Principles of Islam

One of the matters of Islam essentially known is as follows: 'Ilm is the first element of iman. This is the 'asl of attesting to the truth, itikad and certainty. Their existence can be conceived only with it. 'Ilm comes before them and it is the rectifier of them all. Embracing, submitting and the acceptance of hukm being only from Allah are the second element; this is the amal of the heart.

Qadi Abu Bakr ibn Al Arabi stated: "Whoever states iman is itikad, word (utterance) and amal this individual will have brought together all views. With this statement he will have informed of many different views. Fundamentally in usul and grammatical terms this is not that distant from the investigative methods. Its grammatical method is as follows: Action will either verify or nullify ones word. The Nabi (saw) states: "The eyes will fornicate, the hands will fornicate, the feet will fornicate, the nafs will desire. The limbs will either attest to this or deny this." According to this when it is known that

there is no other deity worthy of worship but Allah and that Muhammad (saw) is His messenger and as a necessity of this when this is stated (uttered) by tongue, with the utterance of these words which are in the state of 'ilm the individual will have acted upon this 'ilm. This way action, word and amal will have actualized orderly immediately after each other. In this state a grammatical iman and an iman of sharee'ah will be constituted. (Ahkam'ul-Qur'an, 2/945)

Ibn Qayyim stated: "There is another fundamental matter here: This is the fact that the essence of iman is made of word and amal. Now word is divided in to two sections:

- 1- The word of heart; this is itikad
- 2- The word of tongue; this is talking with the words of Islam.

Amal is also divided into two sections:

- 1- The amal of heart; this is the niyyah and ikhlas of the heart
- 2- The amal of the limbs.

In this sense when the four points made are vanished then iman is vanished as a whole. Among them for example; if the attesting of the heart is vanished the rest remaining will have no benefit. The reason is because the attesting of the heart is necessary for it to turn into belief and be beneficial. Along with having made i'tiqaad of its truth the annihilation of the amal of the heart is the struggle of the murjiah and Ahl Sunnah. Surely along with the annihilation of the amal of the heart sole attestation will not benefit them. These are its love and its bowing (obedience). Likewise this had not benefited iblis, Pharaoh and his people, nor the Jewish or those who believed that the Rasul (saw) had been true. Moreover they'd openly or in hidden say: he (saw) is not a liar but we will not submit to him nor believe him...Surely the heart not obeying will cause the limbs to not obey. If the heart obeys and bows the organs will similarly obey and bow. Likewise from its non-obedience we'd come the conclusion that the attestation which necessitates obedience is not present. As mentioned previously it is an attestation which necessitates obedience and bowing right after it. The shaikh later mentions itikad, amal, lesser and greater kufr and speaks of shirk, zulm, ignorance and nifak. Afterwards in page 59 he states: look how shirk, kufr, fisq, zulm and ignorance are separated into sections. Just like the kufr that takes one out of Islam and the one that does not take one out of Islam. (Kitab us Salat, 54)

The statement of the shaikh must be taken notice of. Surely in believing in the shahadatayn and for it to be beneficial attestation is necessary. In this sense it is known that attesting is a form of 'ilm. For this reason he says: 'There is a type of ignorance which can take one out of deen and that does not take one out of deen.'

Now if this ignorance which takes one out of deen is not regarding the evil of shirk and tawhid which is the essence of all than what is this mentioned ignorance?

Surely if attesting, does not cause obedience and bowing; it is not beneficial. The obedience of the heart necessitates the obedience of the limbs. In this frame if the limbs are not obeying this will show that the heart is deficient of the attesting necessary for obedience; whereas this is the reality of iman. Surely the ahl sunnah had made ijma that with the annihilation of the amal of the heart the iman will be vanished. As mentioned this is the struggle between the murjiah and the ahl sunnah.

Ibn Taymiyyah said: "We know it as the necessity of the deen of Allah; when an individual attests from the heart, with this attestation if he does not act upon it he will be made takfir of. For instance loving him (saw), respecting him (saw) and making salawat when mentioning him (saw)." (Fatawa, 7/131)

1-The Necessities of Actualizing Iman

Ibn Taymiyyah has stated: "The salaf would say: Iman is knowing by heart, utterance by tongue and acting with the limbs." (fatawa 7/144)

Likewise the imam states: "If only they had believed in Allah, in the Prophet, and in what hath been revealed to him, never would they have taken them for friends and protectors." (al-Maida 5/81) "But no, by the Lord, they can have no (real) Faith, until they make thee judge in all disputes between them, and find in their souls no resistance against Thy decisions, but accept them with the fullest conviction." (An-Nisa 4/65) Surely Allah had made the hukm of iman stable as a condition for these situations. According to this it is stable that: surely iman knows what it cannot be without and the absolute necessities it requires." (Fatawa, 7/150)

Narrating from Ahmad ibn Hanbal he states: "Abu Salama al Huzai said: Malik, Shurayk, Abu Bakr b. Iyash, Abdulaziz ibn. Abu Salama, Hammad b. Salama and Hammad ibn Zayd said: Iman is knowledge, utterance and action." (Fatawa, 7/239)

"Ahmad stated: Whoever claims iman is expression in this case what will he say about knowledge. Is there need for knowledge besides expression? Likewise is there need for attesting? If he claims that besides expression there is the need for knowledge in this case he will have stated iman consists of two things. Or if he claims the individual must express and attest he will have increased this to three things even if he denies this. If he states there is no need for knowledge or attestation in this case he will have said something very large which I doubt anyone will claim there is no need for action besides knowledge and attesting." (Fatawa 7/393)

"Allah had commanded we say the following in salah: "Show us the straight way; The way of those on whom Thou hast bestowed Thy Grace, those whose (portion) is not wrath, and who go not astray." (Al-Fatiha 1/6-7) And RasulAllah (saw) stated: "The Jews are those who are in wrath and the Christians are those who have gone astray." The Jews recognize haqq as they recognize their own children however they do not submit to it; they carry jealousy which causes great kufr and the enmity of haqq. The Christians those who followed in compassion and mercy carry the innovation of monasticism. However they are deprived of 'ilm. Therefore they are deviated. They have knowledge but are deprived of true niyyah. They have an intention of the truth only without the knowledge. When the situation is as such they suppose and submit to hawa. In this situation there is no room left for neither beneficial knowledge nor beneficial intention. On the contrary there is nothing left but the ahl kitab mushrik Allah mentions: "They will further say: "Had we but listened or used our intelligence, we should not (now) be among the Companions of the Blazing Fire!" (Al-Mulk 67/10) "Many are the Jinns and men we have made for Hell:

They have hearts wherewith they understand not, eyes wherewith they see not, and ears wherewith they hear not. They are like cattle,- nay more misguided: for they are heedless (of warning).” (Al-Araf 7/179) Now the iman in the heart in its condition of sole attestation if there is no amal along with it this will not be iman. The actions of the heart are its necessities like the love for Allah and RasulAllah. Likewise there can not be an iman made of sole hawa and desire. On the contrary in its essence the word and action of the heart must be in the essence of the iman” (Fatawa, 7/528-529)

Ibn Qayyim stated: "The heart has two functions: only can one be mu'min with both of them. The first is the duty of knowledge (skill) and 'ilm. The second duty is love, subjecting and submitting. Likewise just as without the actualizing of 'ilm and itikad one can not be mu'min in the same sense without actualizing love, obedience and submitting one can not be mu'min. Moreover in spite of 'ilm and marifah if one abandons these wajib this will be a greater kufr. He will be much further from iman than the one who is kafir due to ignorance." (Miftah'u Dar'is-Saade, 1/95)

In the same manner he also stated: "Surely iman is fard upon everyone. This is an essence made of 'ilm and amal. Basically the existence of iman can not be thought of without 'ilm and amal. Now can any of the ibadaah which is the right of Allah be possible without 'ilm? Is it possible to attain 'ilm knowledge without request?" (Miftah'u Dar'is-Saade, 1/156)

With the utterance of the shahadatayn of the servant the Islamic hukm become valid upon him. Naturally in this sense along with its utterance as long as he has not interfered with shirk or as long as there is not evidence that his itikad has changes or corrupted it will be accepted that the iman remains inside which verifies his Islam. If after uttering if he performs ibadaah to any other than Allah or if he befriend the mushrik, helps them and loves them or if he sees it permissible to obey them, that someone mocks the ayah of Allah and to submit to shariahs other than the sharee'ah of Allah, if he turns his face from RasulAllah and does not embrace his method and usul or if he embraces another method other than his (saw) on the path which leads to Allah in this dhahir state we will understand that the asl of his iman is corrupted. This is either due to the lack of knowledge regarding one of the bases of iman or due to lack of obedience and love which is the amal of the heart as the second section and basis. As the iman corrupts Islam corrupts in the same manner. Likewise the ulamaa had accepted iman being sahih for the health of Islam as bases. In this way the servant will be kafir in both dhahir and batin. This is especially due to his invalidation of the kalimat shahadah which is the 'asl of deen.

Ibn Rajab stated: "Therefore the absence of the shahadatayn -two testimonies; testifying one's faith Allah (awj) and RasulAllah (saw)- ruins the existence of Islam...This indicates that having faith in Allah (awj) and His Messenger (saw) represents the core of Islam... Along with this when he enters Islam he is responsible of performing the other matters of Islam. Whoever abandons shahadatayn he will have left Islam. Regarding leaving Islam by abandoning salah there is a known famous well known ikhtilaf among the scholars regarding this. The abandoning of the rest of the five fundamentals that rely on Islam is the same." (Jami'ul-Ulum'i wa'l-Hikmah, 23)

Biithnillah before ending this matter we find it will be beneficial to list the mentioned matters.

1- Surely the transition from shirk and kufr to Islam and the condition that the sword is lifted from the heads of the mushrik relies on abstracting from shirk to tawhid of Allah in obedience and deity without shirk.

2- When entering Islam 'ilm regarding shahadatayn is necessary because this is only possible by distancing form shirk and transition to tawhid.

3- The submitting to tawhid and embracing Islam only in spite of imitating ancestors in dhahir will not benefit its owner in the akhirah.

4- The mushrik is ignorant of Allah. He does not know Allah and does not worship Allah. On the contrary whoever this mushrik may be although he will defend it else wise he is worshipping the shaitan.

5- Ibadaah will only actualize with two conditions

a. Tawhid of Allah in uluhiyyah

b. The state of the servant must be that he is solely submitted to Allah.

6- Allah has attributes and the one who does not know them will be ignorant and will not have recognized Him (awj). The first wajib upon the servant is to know the attributes of the uluhiyyah of Allah. The servant will be freed from worshipping other deities and will begin ibadaah to the wahid and kahhar Allah.

7- The individual will be saved in the akhirah only by embracing in batin and dhahir the kalimat shahadah, knowing what it means, attesting to it and with certainty.

8- Islam is submitting to the one and only Allah it means tawhid of Allah in obedience. Whoever makes ibadaah to Allah and another will not be accepted as Muslim. Also the one who does not perform ibadaah to Allah, both of these are those who make kufr to their Rabb; they are kafir.

9- The utterance of risalah necessitates embracing or else this will not be real, it will be in moral and the hukm of Islam will not be valid.

10- The hanif is the one who abandons shirk knowingly and with perception to submit to Allah.

11- Shirk is ibadaah to those others but Allah. The proof this is invalid is misak, fitrah and 'aql. Only will the shirk doer be punished in darayn after nabawi hujjah has been established. Along with this he will not be benefiting the benefits of the akhirah either. He is not Muslim in dunya until he makes tawhid of wahid and kahhar Allah and rejects those worshiped other than Allah.

12- It is shirk to accept the hukm of those other than Allah and RasulAllah and it is accepting another as a deity.

13- Whoever rebels Allah with ittifak he is kafir. Whoever rebels due to desire (if he sins) according to the ahl sunnah wal jamaa'ah he will not be made takfir of. Only the Khawaarij make takfir of them. The prior exceeds the frame of ibadaah by rebelling the hakimiyyah of Allah and that he had been created for Allah.

14- Islam can only accept an iman which will attest to it. Likewise iman will benefit with the Islam in the dhahir which will inform the iman. Or else it will go no further than only claim. Iman is uttering, knowledge, embracing and obeying.

15- With the utterance of Islam the Islamic worldly hukm will be valid. Of course unless shirk infects it and unless there is dhahir evidence that the itikad had been corrupted.

16- Whoever believes that the one to utter the shahdatayn is ahl jannah and will not be punished with fire without embracing and acting upon it then he is a murtad, a kafir. He will be invited to repent if he repents that is great, if not his neck will be cut. The reason for this is because it means permitting faction.

This matter has been explained with the understanding of the ummah of the salaf and the evidences. It has been explained with the statements of the salafy saleheen and their attributions also it has been explained with the problems of iman and its connection. Also it has been explained with the understanding of the terms and uluhiyyah and ibadaah. This is only to strengthen the understanding of Islam and with the expectance that mankind will be saved. We also call upon mankind to have control over the murjiah thought to recognize it and keep distant from it. Such generations have been raised that even before they distance from shirk and the mushrik by uttering only the shahadatayn they believe to be Muslim. They have come to believe that the expression of the shahadatayn is sufficient and will lead them to salvation in darayn (both the dunya and the akhirah).

May Allah protect us and save us from this deviation and lead us to haqq. Our strength and power is from Allah (awj).

3. irtidad (الارتداد) and Ignorance not being influential in irtidad

1- Evidences from the Qur'an regarding ignorance not being influential in irtidad

a- Ignorance is the Essence and Reason of Nifaq

“But they only deceive themselves, and realize (it) not!” (Al-Baqarah 2/9)

Tabari stated: "In this ayah those who claim 'surely Allah will not punish His servants other than those which make kufr to their Rabb out of stubbornness. Likewise when the true nature of the individual who has a stubborn attitude becomes definite in not accepting tawhid, the book and the messengers, towards his rabb; Allah will only then punish an individual in such condition' there is the most clearest of evidences that Allah (jj) rejects this statement. Allah has attributed individuals who try to fool themselves and the mu'min with nifak as "...and realize (it) not!" With the things they are in and build; they are baatil doers. With the deception they believe they fool their rabb and ahl iman in reality they deceit themselves. Later Allah (jj) informs that He will punish them with a very distressing punishment. They had claimed to be mu'min although they had been upon kufr and denied the nubbuwwa of His nabi."

Qurtubi had explained the ayah in the following manner: "...and realize (it) not" meaning that they do not understand and comprehend that the consequences of their deception will return to them. And they believe that with their deception they have found salvation and are saved. This is only their state in this world. In the akhirah it will be said to them: "Turn ye back to your rear!" (al-Hadid 57/13)"

Shawkani stated: "Of a surety, they are the ones who make mischief, but they realize (it) not." (Al-Baqarah 2/12) The reason they do not realize it most likely because: Although they know they had been upon corruption they tried to show they are upon haqq and they thought the Prophet would not notice what they had hidden inside and they could not realize that he already knew and that news regarding this came to him from the sky. Knowing and comprehension being taken away from them is in this context or else it is not in the sense that they did not know they had been upon corruption. Perhaps it is possible their corruption had been because the love for kufr and enmity of Islam settled in their minds seemed as haqq to them."

Ibn Kathir said: "In the tafsir of this ayah Ibn Jarir narrates from Mujahid the following: When they had sinned with this they had been told: Do not do this. They replied: Surely we are upon hidayah (we are doing the righteous)." (Tafsir)

Ibn Kathir also narrated that "Ibn Ishaq, Ibn Jarir and Ibn Abu Hatam narrated from Salman the following: Salman read this ayah and said the persons addressed in this ayah did not come later on. Ibn Jarir states: Likely with this Salman had meant that those who carry this attribute today are more disgusting in corruption than those during the era of Nabi (saw). Or else he did not mean that no one else had come or gone which carried this attribute." (Tafsir)

Imam Shawkani states: "It is probable that Salman had thought this ayah was not about the munafiq. Maybe he had specified this to the ahl fitnah; the ahl fitnah which had found it appropriate to bring down the sword among the Muslimeen. For instance, the individuals such as the Khawaarij and those who see the corruption that pestered them by their baatil doubts, as haqq." "Nay, of a surety they are the fools, but they do not know." (Al-Baqarah 2/13) meaning they are ignorant. "But they do not know" meaning they do not understand.

Baghawī stated: "They do not comprehend" meaning they do not know that their act of fooling themselves will return to them. "But they do not know" meaning they do not know they are defeatists with that which they do. The reason is because of the ornaments on the lining of their

filthy kufr they think they are upon haqq. This has also been interpreted as ‘they do not know the punishment Allah had prepared for them’.”

Ibn Kathir: “They try to deceive Allah and those who believe”. The hypocrites show belief outwardly while concealing disbelief. They think that by doing this, they will mislead Allah, or that the statements they utter will help them with Allah and this is an indication of their total ignorance. They think that such behavior will deceive Allah, just as it might deceive some of the believers. Similarly, Allah said, “On the Day when Allah will resurrect them all together; then they will swear to Him as they swear to you. And they think that they have something (to stand upon). Verily, they are liars!” (Mujadala 58/18). Hence, Allah refuted their way by saying, “While they only deceive themselves, and perceive (it) not!” Allah stated that the hypocrites only deceive themselves by this behavior, although they are unaware of this fact.” (Tafsir)

“Of a surety, they are the ones who make mischief, but they realize (it) not.” (Al-Baqarah 2/12)

Ibn Kathir “Verily, they are the ones who make mischief, but they perceive not.). This Ayah means that the hypocrites' behavior, and their claim that it is for peace, is itself mischief, although in their ignorance, they do not see it to be mischief.” (Tafsir)

“But they do not know.” (Al-Baqarah 2/13)

Ibn Kathir: “But they know not” Since they are so thoroughly ignorant, the hypocrites are unaware of their degree of deviation and ignorance, and such situation is more dangerous, a severer case of blindness, and further from the truth than one who is aware.” (Tafsir)

“Or (another similitude) is that of a rain-laden cloud from the sky: In it are zones of darkness, and thunder and lightning” (Al-Baqarah 2/19)

Ibn Kathir: “This is another parable which Allah gave about the hypocrites who sometimes know the truth and doubt it at other times. When they suffer from doubt, confusion and disbelief, their hearts are.” (Tafsir)

1- Description of the Munafiq

The following is abridged from Tariq al-Hijratin wa Bab as-Sa'adatain of Ibn Qayyim al-Jawzi (ra):

“...Verily this level is for the most miserable of the wretched ones, so for this reason, they shall be belittled and mocked in the hereafter. A light shall be given to them thereby they will traverse with it upon the Sirat Then, Allah (awj) shall extinguish their light and it shall be said to them: "Go back to your rear and then seek a light. So a wall will be placed between them, with a gate therein." (al-Hadid 57/13) and this is the most severe [form] of immense regret and affliction- namely, that the path of salvation and success is opened for the servant to the point where he thought that he was safe-seeing the dwellings and levels of the happy ones- however, suddenly, he is cut off from them and is struck with wretchedness, and we seek refuge with Allah from His anger and punishment.

This level is in the lowest part of the fire due to the severity of their Kufr. That is because they mixed and intermingled with the Muslims and lived with them witnessing from the signs of the message [i.e. Islam]

and signs of Iman that which the far off ones [i.e. the original open Kuffar] did not. There arrived to them from knowledge of it and its correctness that which did not reach to those who declare their enmity and animosity [towards Islam].

So, if they disbelieved with this knowledge and awareness, they are then more severe in Kufr and more vile of heart and stronger in enmity to Allah, His Messenger and the believers than the far off ones from them [i.e. the open Kuffar], even if the far off ones embark upon war against the Muslims. For this reason, the Most High said, "that is because they believed and then they disbelieved." And the Most High said about them: "blind, deaf and dumb so they will not return." And Allah said about the Kuffar: "blind, deaf and dumb so they do not use their intellect."

The Kafir did not understand, yet the Munafiq perceived and saw and was thereafter blinded. He knew, yet thereafter he feigned ignorance. He admitted yet then he denied. He believed yet then disbelieved. So, whoever is like this, then he is more severe in Kufr and filthier of heart and more haughty against Allah and his Messenger.

So, they deserved the 'Dark al-Asfal' [the absolute lowest part of the hell-fire], and there is another meaning to that as well and that is: the motivating factor that which carried them to Nifaq was the search for honor and rank between the two groups [the believers and the Kuffar], so they please the believers so as to obtain honor from them and they please the Kuffar so that they give them honor as well. It is from this [area] that the affliction struck them. They desired the two honors from the two groups. They had no purpose in Iman, Islam or obedience to Allah and His Messenger; rather their inclination, affection and direction was towards the Kuffar. As a result, they received the most tremendous humiliation and that is by them taking as their permanent abode the position of the lowest of the low under the Kuffar.

Due to that the Munafiqun are described with of seeking to deceive Allah and His Messenger and those who believe, poking fun at the people of Iman, lying, playing with the Deen while manifesting themselves as if they are from the believers, concealing Kufr, Shirk and enmity towards Allah and His Messenger to an extent that surpasses the Kuffar, due to all of this their Kufr was severe and they deserved the 'Dark al-Asfal' of the fire.

For this reason, Allah made mention of the types and divisions of the creation in the beginning of Surah al-Baqarah,

"This is the Book (the Qur'an), whereof there is no doubt, a guidance to those who are Al-Muttaqun [the pious and righteous persons who fear Allah much (abstain from all kinds of sins and evil deeds which He has forbidden) and love Allah much (perform all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained)]. Who believe in the Ghaib and perform As-Salat (Iqamat-as-Salat), and spend out of what we have provided for them [i.e. give Zakat, spend on themselves, their parents, their children, their wives, etc., and also give charity to the poor and also in Allah's Cause - Jihaad, etc.]. And who believe in (the Qur'an and the Sunnah) which has been sent down (revealed) to you (Muhammad Peace be upon him) and in [the

Taurat (Torah) and the Injeel (Gospel), etc.] which were sent down before you and they believe with certainty in the Hereafter. (Resurrection, recompense of their good and bad deeds, Paradise and Hell, etc.). They are on (true) guidance from their Lord, and they are the successful. Verily, those who disbelieve, it is the same to them whether you (O Muhammad Peace be upon him) warn them or do not warn them, they will not believe. Allah has set a seal on their hearts and on their hearings, (i.e. they are closed from accepting Allah's Guidance), and on their eyes there is a covering. Theirs will be a great torment.

And of mankind, there are some (hypocrites) who say: "We believe in Allah and the Last Day" while in fact they believe not. They (think to) deceive Allah and those who believe, while they only deceive themselves, and perceive (it) not! In their hearts is a disease (of doubt and hypocrisy) and Allah has increased their disease. A painful torment is theirs because they used to tell lies. And when it is said to them: "Make not mischief on the earth," they say: "We are only peacemakers." Verily! They are the ones who make mischief, but they perceive not. And when it is said to them (hypocrites): "Believe as the people (followers of Muhammad Peace be upon him , Al-Ansar and Al-Muhajirun) have believed," they say: "Shall we believe as the fools have believed?" Verily, they are the fools, but they know not. And when they meet those who believe, they say: "We believe," but when they are alone with their Shayatin (devils - polytheists, hypocrites, etc.), they say: "Truly, we are with you; verily, we were but mocking." Allah mocks at them and gives them increase in their wrong-doings to wander blindly. These are they who have purchased error for guidance, so their commerce was profitless. And they were not guided. Their likeness is as the likeness of one who kindled a fire; then, when it lighted all around him, Allah took away their light and left them in darkness. (So) they could not see. They are deaf, dumb, and blind, so they return not (to the Right Path). Or like a rainstorm from the sky, wherein is darkness, thunder, and lightning. They thrust their fingers in their ears to keep out the stunning thunderclap for fear of death. But Allah ever encompasses the disbelievers (i.e. Allah will gather them all together). The lightning almost snatches away their sight, whenever it flashes for them, they walk therein, and when darkness covers them, they stand still. And if Allah willed, He could have taken away their hearing and their sight. Certainly, Allah has power over all things. " (al-Baqarah 2/1-20).

Therein He (swt) divided them into:

- A believer both inwardly and outwardly
- A disbeliever both inwardly and outwardly
- A believer outwardly and a disbeliever inwardly- and they are the Munafiqun.

Allah revealed three Ayat concerning the believers [3-5] and two Ayat with respect to the disbelievers (6-8). So, when Allah reached the Munafiqun, He mentioned about ten or so Ayat [8-20] condemning them therein with the strongest form of condemnation, unveiling their secrets, rebuking them and exposing them.

He mentioned that they are:

- The foolish ones
- The ones who sow corruption upon the earth
- Those who seek to deceive
- Those who poke fun and belittle [the believers]
- Those who were beguiled and duped by their purchase of misguidance for guidance
- He mentioned them being blind, deaf, and dumb so they will not return [to the truth]
- They are with diseased hearts and Allah increases sickness upon their sickness

Allah did not leave any disparagement or defect except that He described them with it and this indicates how severe indeed His hatred, abhorrence, and enmity for them is and that [indicates] they are the most hated of His enemies to Him.

His penetrating wisdom is made apparent by Him choosing for them this level of 'ad- 'Dark al- Asfal' of the fire- we seek refuge with Allah from their condition and we ask Him for His pardon and mercy.

Whoever contemplates what Allah has described the Munafiqun with in the Qur'an from the attributes of condemnation, he will know that they have more right to the 'Dark al- Asfal' for He has described them as:

Those who seek to deceive Him and His servants

Those whose hearts are sick- and it is the sickness of doubts and misconceptions

Sowing corruption in the earth, belittling His Deen and His servants- transgressing the limits

Purchasing misguidance for guidance

Blindness, deafness, and dumbness and laziness in worshipping Him

Fornication

Lack of His remembrance

Indecisiveness- and that is wavering between the believers and the Kuffar- they are not with these nor with those

Swearing by Allah in falsehood and lying

Possessing the peak of cowardliness

A lack of understanding the religion and no knowledge

Stinginess

Absence of Iman in Allah and the last day

That they are harmful to the believers.

They obtain nothing from their (the believers) sincere advice save evil from hindrance and rushing to evil between them and spreading Fitnah

Their hatred for the command [i.e. the victory] of Allah to become manifest

Their pursuit in eradicating the truth

That they become saddened by what happens to the believers from good and victory and they become delighted and joyous over what befalls them from trials and tribulations.

They lie in ambush for the believers

Their hatred of spending (wealth) for the pleasure of Allah and in His path.

Their finding fault with the believers and accusing them of matters that they are free from- hence, they defame those who give Sadaqah and they find fault with their small amount [that they may give] and they accuse most of them of Riya' [showing off] and desiring the praise of the people.

That they are slaves of the worldly life. If they are given a portion, they are pleased and if they are denied then they are unhappy.

That they harm RasulAllah (saw) and they attribute to him that which Allah has declared him free of They find fault with him in what is from his virtue and completion [perfection]

They intend the pleasure of the creation instead of the pleasure of the Lord of the worlds

That they make fun of the believers

That they become delighted if they are [able] to stay behind RasulAllah (saw)

That they hate Jihaad in the cause of Allah

That they make excuses for their abandonment of the obligations of Allah upon them with various forms of excuses

That they are pleased to lag behind in the obedience to Allah and His Messenger

That their hearts are sealed

That they abandon that which Allah has made obligatory upon them while they have the ability to do it.

That they swear by Allah more than anyone else- they have taken their oaths as a shield that protects them from the censure of the Muslims upon him. This is the affair of the Munafiq. He swears by Allah while lying and has taken his oath as a shield protecting himself by it from the censure of the Muslims upon him.

He has described them with "Rijs". The Rijs is the filthiest and disgusting thing found in a species. So they are the vilest and filthiest of the sons of Adam and the most despicable of them.

That they are Fasiqun [criminals, corrupt]

That they are a source of harm to the people of Iman- intending to divide them

That they give aid and succor to those that wage war against Allah and His Messenger (saw)

That they imitate them [the believers] and resemble them in their actions so that by it they can harm them and split their word [i.e. unity] and this is always the case with the Munafiqun.

That they have put themselves into trial by their disbelief in Allah and His Messenger and that they lie in ambush for them [the believers] and this is their manner and custom in every era.

That they had doubt in the Deen, therefore they didn't believe in it- and the false wishes and hopes beguiled them and deceived them and the Shaytan seduced them.

That they are the best of people in bodies and physical build- for the person will be amazed when he sees their bodies and the one who listens to them will be amazed with their speech. However, if you went past their physical bodies and their words you would find them as propped up wood- with no Iman and no Fiqh [understanding of the religion] and no knowledge and no Sidq [truthfulness]. On the contrary, they are like wood that has donned clothing. It delights the on looker and yet behind it [the clothing] there is nothing.

That if Tawbah [repentance] was offered to them they would refuse and claim that they have no need of it- either due to what is in them from heresy and compound ignorance of it and the acts of obedience in general- like many of the heretics- or out of beguilement and pronounced arrogance towards the one who called them to it.

He, the Glorified, described them with mocking and jesting with Him, His Ayat and his Messenger.

That they are Mujrimun [criminals]
That they command the evil and forbid the good
That they grasp [hold back] their hands from spending out in his pleasure
That they forget his remembrance
That they turn to the Kuffar and abandon the believers.
That the Shaytan has gained mastery over them and overcame them so he caused them to forget the remembrance of Allah- therefore they do not remember Allah but very little.
That they are the party of Shaytan
That they ally themselves with those that oppose Allah and His Messenger
That they have hope for and wish for that which will distress the believers and cause them hardship
That their hatred has manifested in their mouths and from the slips of their tongues
That they say with their tongues what is not in their hearts.

And from the attributes that they have been described with by RasulAllah (saw) is:

Lying in speech
Betraying the trust
Breaching the contracts
Licentiousness in argumentation
Breaking the promise [al- Bukhari-1/33 al- Fath]
Delaying the Salah to the end of its appointed time while performing it quickly and hastily.
Leaving its attendance in the congregation- "and the heaviest of prayers upon them is the morning and 'Isha'."
[al- Bukhari- al- Fath 2/608]

From the attributes that Allah has described them with is:

Avarice [extreme greed] upon the believers in good, cowardice in the times of fear.
That when the fear departs and the safety comes they lash out at the believers with their sharp tongues- therefore they have the sharpest tongues of people against them as it was said:

That in the times of fear they make apparent the secrets of their chests and what is hidden in their hearts As for during the times of safety and peace, it is binding to conceal it. So if fear befell the Muslims, the scorpions of their hearts will have crept up and approached.
That of the people, they have the sweetest of tongues while they are the most bitter of hearts.
That they are the greatest of people in opposition [contradiction] between their actions and words.
That pleasant silence and understanding of the Deen does not coincide with them
Their actions disown and give lie to their words and their innermost selves give lie and disown their apparent [outward] and their innermost secrets contradict their open and public selves.
That the believer does not trust them for they have prepared a way out of every affair whether in truth or falsehood- whether with truth or with lies
So due to this, he has been called a Munafiq. Taken from Nafaqa al- Yarbu'- the tunnel of the Jerboa [the

jerboa is a mouse like jumping rodent found in the Desert regions of Eurasia and Africa.]. It is an abode that it digs and places in it many different burrows and points of entry. This is so that whenever it is sought after from a burrow, it flees to another burrow- so the one seeking after it cannot take hold of it in one burrow. The poet said:

And he removes the jerboa from his burrows
And from his cave with an avid greed

Their affair is basically that they are in the Muslim jamaa'ah like the counterfeit money in a pile of currency. They circulate among most of the people because of the people's lack of insight in the quality of currency [separating the real from the counterfeit]. The individual who is well acquainted and discerning knows their condition- and how few they [that type] are!

Nothing is more harmful to the Deens than these types of people and the religions are only corrupted by way of them. For this reason, Allah made their affair clear in the Qur'an and He clarified their attributes and made clear their condition. He oft repeated their mention due to the severity of burden upon the Muslim Ummah from them, and the tremendous nature of their afflictions and trials placed upon the Ummah because of their presence among them and due to the dire need of having knowledge of them and taking precaution from resembling them and lending them an ear and listening to them.

Indeed, how many have they severed travelling to Allah, the path of guidance and how many have they taken with them to the path of destruction and ruin! They promised them and indulged them in hopes but they have promised them only delusion and they have indulged them in hopes of only woe and loss.

And how many have they killed but in the path of destruction and Shaytan and how many have they taken as a prisoner with no hope for his release and how many of those are fleeing from Allah and not to Him!

Accompanying them brings about shame and disgrace and loving them brings about the anger of al-Jabbar and obligates entering the fire.

For by Allah, they are the highway robbers. Oh riders and travellers to the ranks and levels of the people of happiness; beware of them- beware! They are the butchers, their tongues being the blades of affliction. Flee from them, oh flock flee!

And from the [greatest] of affliction is that they are the enemies in truth and we have no escape from accompanying and mixing with them. Mixing with them is the greatest disease yet there is no escape from mixing with them. They have placed callers upon the doors of Jahannam so woe to those that answer. They have placed their netting around it- around what has been surrounded by desires so woe to the delusional ones. They have placed the netting and stretched out the snare and a caller from amongst them called out:

And they said: enter the door of humiliation lowly and small and do not say "hattah" for today there is no "hattah". What an amazing thing for the one who was saved from there snares-not the one who was ensnared, how and when will he be saved, the one whose ruin has overcome him and for it he was created.

So it is proper upon the people of this level to encamp at their area that Allah has placed for them from the abode of humiliation and to descend to the most despicable level of the people of kufr and opposition.

According to the level of the servant's Iman and knowledge will be the servant's fear of being from this level. For this reason, the notables of this Ummah and its predecessors had severe fear for themselves from being from this level.

'Umar ibn Al Khattab said: "Oh Hudhayfah: I ask you by Allah, did the Prophet [sallallahu alayhi was sallam] name me from those people [the Munafiqun]? He said: " no, and I will not ever purify anyone else after you." (al-Bukhari 416)

This means: I will not open up this door upon me purifying people. This does not mean that he wouldn't declare anyone else to be free of Nifaq.

Ibn Abi Mulaykah said, "I met thirty companions of RasullAllah (saw), all of them feared Nifaq for himself and none of them said that he was upon the Iman of Jibril or Mikail." (Tariq al-Hijratain wa Bab as-Sa'adatain)

i- The Types of Munafiq and their Condition

Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "Some claim this; in Arabic the word 'aw' (or) is used to chose one out of two things; meaning to make 'tahyir'. For instance like the following statement: the one sitting is either Hasan or Ibn Shirin. This claim does not express anything because tahyir will not be in sentences that inform only in expressions that are commands and requests. What is meant by this is to inform the state of the mu'min. This shows us this: In the first example: summun bukmun 'umyun (Deaf, dumb, and blind) (Al-Bakarah 2/18), In the second example it is said: yaj'aloona asaabi'ahum fee adhaanihim (They press their fingers in their ears). Now in the second example it is informed that they hear and see. If Allah had requested He'd rid their hearing and sight. In the first they were able to see but they had been left in the dark where they could not see. Therefore they became summon, bukmun and 'umyun. In the second they walked when the thunderbolt illuminated. When it became dark they stopped. According to this they had two states: the state of light and the state of dark. The first had been left in complete darkness. Fundamentally the first example is the expression of the individual who had been in the light but later was left in the dark. In the second example is the situation of the individual who is left neither in light nor the dark. On the contrary his state changes constantly and this in this state influences the position and situation. This informs the following; with the particle "aw" Allah had given two examples

for the kuffar: "But the Unbelievers,- their deeds are like a mirage in sandy deserts, which the man parched with thirst mistakes for water; until when he comes up to it, he finds it to be nothing: But he finds Allah (ever) with him, and Allah will pay him his account: and Allah is swift in taking account. Or (the Unbelievers' state) is like the depths of darkness in a vast deep ocean, overwhelmed with billow topped by billow, topped by (dark) clouds: depths of darkness, one above another: if a man stretches out his hands, he can hardly see it! for any to whom Allah giveth not light, there is no light!." (an-Nur 24/39-40) Here the first is an example of the kufr which the doer believed he had been upon haqq with whereas he is upon baatil. Just like the individual whose evil amal are adorned and he sees them as good. Now an individual as such does not know moreover he does not know that he does not know. For this reason he has been describes as the mirage in sandy deserts. The second is an example of the one who does not think of his kufr. Moreover he is in deep darkness. Likewise whosoever's ignorance is great he will not carry the thought of being upon haqq (he is that distant). On the contrary as long as he keeps deviant and ignorant he will continue to stay in darkness. According to this, the munafiq and kafir are sometimes attributed with this designation and sometimes with the other. Fundamentally the separation in these examples is sourced from being according to the individual and conditions. As understood some munafiq do sometimes have iman and later they make kufr from within. This is a situation which according to the scholars of hadith, tafsir and siyaar examples abundantly mentioned. According to this there had been some people who made iman first and later became munafiq. This was due to many reasons. One of them being the command of the qiblah; when it was changed because of this (change) a group had left their iman (made irtidad/ became murtad). Fundamentally this had been a test Allah put mankind through. The following is stated in the ayah; "We appointed the Qiblah to which thou wast used, only to test those who followed the Messenger from those who would turn on their heels (From the Faith)." (Al-Baqarah 2/143) Meaning We did this to test the people by turning you from it. This way those who submitted to the Rasul and those who turned on their heels would be distinguished. In the tashri (law making) of this there had been this hikmah. In the same sense in Uhud when the Muslim had been defeated when the face of the Nabi (saw) had been cut and his tooth broke, a group of people made irtidad (became murtad) and nifaq (became munafiq). The following is stated in the ayah: "Allah's object also is to purge those that are true in Faith and to deprive of blessing those that resist Faith." (Al-i Imran 3/141) "They were that day nearer to Unbelief than to Faith." (Al-i Imran 3/167) The statement of "to deprive of blessing Those that resist Faith" mentioned in the ayah is clear regarding those who fell into nifaq. This section takes in hand those who did not previously fall into nifaq and those who had been in nifaq and repeated their nifaq. The statement "They were that day nearer to Unbelief than to Faith" mentioned in the ayah shows that they had not been nearer than them. On the contrary with them they are either equal to iman or close to it. Fundamentally this was like this. When Ibn Ubayy had abandoned RasulAllah (saw) at Uhud, a third of the people had left. It had been said that they were 300 in number. Not all of them had been munafiq inside because there had not been anyone who called them to nifaq. In summary there are many examples long to mention in the narrations regarding those who made nifaq after iman. Basically those people had been Muslim, they had iman within and this is the light Allah gave an example with. If they had died prior to this test and nifaq they would have died as Muslims. They would have gained rewards against this. However when they were tested, as they were not among the real mu'min who had persevered their iman that they had, neither were they among the real munafiq who had made irtidad from their iman when they were

tested. This is the situation many of today's Muslim is in or when most of them are tested with an imtahan which demolishes the ahl iman their iman lessens greatly. This way most of them act like a munafiq or most of them are from them. Now some of them show their irtidad when the enemy is great in numbers or when they defeat. Surely we and others have seen many times exemplary settings as such. Now if there is well being or if the Muslims defeat their enemies they will be Muslim. These are in batin and dhahir those who believed in the Rasul however an iman which could not stand hardship. (Fatawa, 7/281)

It is understood from the explanations of the ayah from the salafus saliheen that: there are many types of munafiq. Some of them show Islam in the dhahir however hide their kufr. When it is as such he thinks he is upon haqq and as he fooled the Nabi (saw) and the mu'min he believes he will fool Allah (may Allah protect us from this). This is due to their ignorance regarding Allah (awj). They do not know that Allah (awj) has surrounded everything with His (awj) 'ilm. As He (awj) knows the treachery in the eyes, He (awj) knows what is in the hearts.

Some of them go between iman and nifaq because they are pestered with doubts and uncertainties. This is because there is no beneficial 'ilm that will rid and refute these and in this state, when they are enlightened they are mu'min but later when this light abandons them and darkness takes place, they fall into nifaq. Some of them are mu'min in dhahir and in batin. However their iman is weak. They cannot endure imtahan and calamity, so when they come across unpleasantness they will drive back on their heels, and will turn back (from Faith). Just like those who made irtidad with the change of the qiblah and the moment of Isra (Mi'raj). On the other hand many have fallen in nifaq during Uhud. They had not been munafiq before. The following ayah mentions this:

"There are among men some who serve Allah, as it were, on the verge: if good befalls them, they are, therewith, well content; but if a trial comes to them, they turn on their faces: they lose both this world and the Hereafter: that is loss for all to see!" (al-Hajj 22/11)

Narrated Ibn Abbas (ra): "Regarding the Verse: "And among men is he who worships Allah's as it were on the very edge." (22.11). A man used to come to madinah as if his wife brought a son and his mares produces offspring. He would say, "This religion (Islam) is good," but if his wife did not give birth to a child and his mares produced no offspring, he would say, "This religion is bad." (Bukhari)

Ibn Kathir narrated that Mujahid commented on the ayah: "he turns back on his face." "(This means), he becomes an apostate and a disbeliever." (Tafsir)

This man in dhahir and batin had come as a muhajir, in every qadr that is khair he came across he accounted it as the sign of truth of the deen and when he came across qadr that is sharr, he accounted it as a sign that it is baatil. With this ignorance and ta'weel he had made irtidad from Islam. Surely the ulamaa used this term to comprise all ahl bidat.

"Of a surety, they are the ones who make mischief, but they realise (it) not." (Al-Baqarah 2/12) The ayah

which we are making tafsir of even though it is regarding the munafiq, consideration is not according to the cause in particular, it is according to the generality of the statements.

Surely everyone who performs fasid amal will believe this is truth. With this amal he will account himself to be the chosen among the creatures of Allah. Whereas in essence these amal only distance from Allah and cause disgrace. These ayahs that we explain comprise all mentioned amal even if they are bid'ah or shirk. When it is as such all these groups believe they are upon a foundation. For this reason in the ayah it is stated:

“One day will Allah raise them all up (for Judgment): then will they swear to Him as they swear to you: And they think that they have something (to stand upon). No, indeed! they are but liars!” (Mujadila 58/18)

Qurtubi stated: “And they think that they have something (to stand upon) They did this by the means of denying their filth and their oath. Ibn Zayd stated: They thought this would benefit them in the akhirah. Ibn Abbas narrated the Nabi (saw) said: On the Day of Judgment a messenger will shout where are the enemies of Allah? Meanwhile the faces of the group of Qadariyyah will darken and their eyes turn deep blue. Sweat will drop from their faces. They will say: Wallahi other than you we did not worship any sun, nor moon nor idol. Other than you we did not take on a deity. Ibn Abbas says: They have told the truth wallahi shirk had infected them from somewhere unknown to them. And recited the following ayah: “And they think that they have something (to stand upon). No, indeed! they are but liars!” (Mujadila 58/18) These individuals are wallahi the qadari and he repeated this thrice. (abridged from Abu Nuaym, Hilya, V, 3)” (Tafsir)

Tabari stated: “And they think that they have something (to stand upon).” (Mujadila 58/18) meaning while they were taking oath and vowing in the name of Allah they believed they had been upon haqq.” (Tafsir)

Ibn Kathir stated: “then they will swear to Him as they swear to you. And they think that they have something.” meaning, they will swear to Allah the Exalted and Most Honored that they were following the guidance and the correct path, just as they used to swear to the believers in this worldly life. Verily, those who live following on a certain path will most likely die while on it. Thus, they will be resurrected upon their path. The hypocrites will think that their vows will help them with Allah, just as they helped with the people, who were obliged to treat them as they pretended to be, Muslim. This is why Allah said, “And they think that they have something” meaning, on account of swearing to their Lord (that they used to be believers).” (Tafsir)

Shawkani stated: “And they think that they have something (to stand upon).” (Mujadila 58/18) Meaning with these false (lie) oaths they had accounted they had been upon a base that would benefit them or rid the harm in the akhirah. Just as they supposed it in dunya.

These nass along with the statements of ulama show us the following: The calamity of all munafiq is

their ignorance, ta'weel and belief of being upon a foundation of haqq likewise differentiating from those who are not upon their i'tiqaad, with the belief that they are smart individuals who will reach salvation in dunya and in akhirah. With this they do not fool any other but themselves, however they do not know this nor do they understand this. Here I will repeat the statement of Tabari, quoted previously:

Tabari in the tafsir of al-Baqarah 2/9 stated: "In this ayah those who claim 'surely Allah will not punish His servants other than those which make kufr to their Rabb out of stubbornness. Likewise when the true nature of the individual who has a stubborn attitude becomes definite in not accepting tawhid, the book and the messengers, towards his rabb; Allah will only then punish an individual in such condition' there is the most clearest of evidences that Allah (jj) rejects this statement. Allah has attributed individuals who try to fool themselves and the mu'min with nifaq as "...and realise (it) not!" With the things they are in and build; they are baatil doers. With the deception they believe they fool their rabb and ahl iman in reality they have deceived themselves. Later Allah (jj) informs that He will punish them with a very distressing punishment. They had claimed to be mu'min although they had been upon kufr and denied the nubbuwwa of His nabi." (Tafsir)

"The ayah which we are making tafsir of, even though it is regarding the munafiq, consideration is not according to the cause in particular, it is according to the generality of the statements." The examples regarding this are as follows: The story of Dhul-Khuwaysirah at-Tamimi, whose name was Hurqus which is the commencing point of Khawaarij. Hurqus protested against the Prophet's division of the war spoils of Hunayn, saying to RasulAllah "Be fair, for you have not been fair!" The Prophet said I would have become a loser and a failure if I was not fair! He had said this because they did not believe in the innocence of the prophets. And later he sees something which is munkar according to his supposition and objects to it; with this denial his nifaq and kufr becomes apparent. But he does not understand this and did not know this was kufr. Regarding this, the following ayah had been revealed: "And among them are men who slander thee in the matter of (the distribution of) the alms." (at-Tawba 9/58) (Bukhari; Muslim)

Regarding this ayah Ibn Taymiyyah (rh) stated that: "Lamz means shame and to condemn. Mujahid had explained this as: he is accusing you and simplifies you. Ata had said it meant: he is gossiping about you in your absence. In the ayah it is stated: "Among them are men who molest the Prophet." (at-Tawba 9/61) This shows that whoever criticizes him or torments him will be from them (the munafiq). The reason is because both allazina and man are ism-i mawsul and both particles that express generality. Even though the ayah had been revealed to condemn a tribe or for the reason to disturb others, both of their hukm are general. Just like many other ayah which had been revealed for many purposes. Fundamentally among people there is no ikhtilaf. According to this, the ayah comprises the individual it had been revealed for and also the individual who is in the same situation. Likewise this being from the mentioned general hukm, it is based on a hukm which is related with a word derived from the words lamz (shame/ condemn) and aza (molest). Therefore it is also proper. According to this, the thing derived from becomes the illah (reason) for the hukm. Therefore it is wajib they (the derived and its illah) follow one another. This is because of the following: the essence of iman and nifaq are in the heart. For this reason that which is dhahir (apparent) with word and action are a part of it and its

evidence. In this sense if anything from one of these (iman, nifaq) becomes apparent, the hukm regarding it will be superimposed. The fact that Haqq ta'ala had informed that the one condemning and molesting the Nabi was from among the munafiq puts forth that this is evidence regarding and that it is a part of nifaq. As known when a part of something and its evidence is produced, the essence it indicates is also produced. This is stabilised that wherever these situations may take place the owner is munafiq. Whether he is munafiq prior to this statement or his nifaq is produced with this statement." (As Sarim'ul Maslul, 30)

Those individuals are also included which are from among the ahl kalam and believe 'there is only need for the 'ilm of sharee'ah in matters of amal and no need in regards to 'ilm of i'tiqaad'. Meaning those who say for the individual there is no need for the 'ilm of sharee'ah in i'tiqaad and can not be limited to its regulations. In the same sense the ahl tasawwuf who believe that the wali is much superior than the Nabi (saw) or that there are other paths which lead to Allah other than the path of the Nabi are included in this hukm. Likewise the individuals who believe that the 'ilm of sharee'ah are for the general people and not for the elite are also included in this hukm. Those who think their shaikh is not responsible with the propositions of the deen are also included. The reason is because according to them these individuals have reached the 'ilm of certainty which is a degree that all the propositions are lifted. They supposedly lean on the following ayah: "And serve thy Lord until there come unto thee the Hour that is Certain." (al-Hijr 15/99) These and likes are all included in the following ayah of Allah (jj): "Of a surety, they are the ones who make mischief, but they realise (it) not." (Al-Baqarah 2/12) These types of statements and nifaq of such individuals have been stabilized even if the doer has been a munafiq prior to or with this statement.

b- The Hukm of Those Who Mock the Ayah of Allah (awj)

The second proof is the following ayah: "If thou dost question them, they declare (with emphasis): "We were only talking idly and in play." Say: "Was it at Allah, and His Signs, and His Messenger that ye were mocking?" Make ye no excuses: ye have rejected Faith after ye had accepted it." (At-Tawba 9/65-66)

Regarding this matter Qadi Abu Bakr b. Al Arabi stated: "Their statements are either serious or idle play. It does not matter how it was, it is still kufr. It is because swearing while joking is also kufr, there is no disagreement among the ulamaa regarding this matter. Researching is the mate of 'ilm and truth; idle play and mockery is the mate of ignorance and baatil." (Ahkam'ul-Kur'an, 2/976-977)

Qurtubi said: "(O Munafiquun!) Make ye no excuses: ye have rejected Faith after ye had accepted it." (At-Tawba 9/66) as if He is saying on account of condemning do not do things that are not beneficial; later it is requested from them that they do not announce an excuse for their sins as if they had been given the hukm of kufr." (Tafsir)

Baghawi stated: "(O Munafiquun!) Make ye no excuses: ye have rejected Faith after ye had accepted it." (At-Tawba 9/66) If it is said that they said while not mu'min how did you make kufr after iman? It will be said its meaning is after displaying iman you displayed kufr." (Tafsir)

Ibn Kathir commented: "Abdullah bin `Umar said, "During the battle of Tabuk, a man was sitting in a gathering and said, 'I have never seen like these reciters of ours! They have the hungriest stomachs, the most lying tongues and are the most cowardice in battle.' A man in the Masjid said, 'You lie. You are a hypocrite, and I will surely inform the RasulAllah. 'This statement was conveyed to the RasulAllah and also a part of the Qur'an was revealed about it.' Abdullah bin `Umar said, "I have seen that man afterwards holding onto the shoulders of the Messenger's camel while stones were falling on him, declaring, 'O RasulAllah! We were only engaged in idle talk and jesting,' while RasulAllah was reciting, Was it at Allah, and His Ayat and His Messenger that you were mocking" [9:65]." Allah said, Make no excuse; you disbelieved after you had believed. On account of your statement and mocking, "If We pardon some of you, We will punish others among you for not all of you will be forgiven, some will have to taste the torment", "because they were criminals", they were criminals because of this terrible, sinful statement." (Tafsir)

Tabari stated: "(O Munafiquun!) Make ye no excuses: ye have rejected Faith after ye had accepted it." (At-Tawba 9/66) The Nabi of Allah (jj) Muhammad (saw) said: Say to those whose attributes are described to you, do not make excuses with baatil things, do not say we were only engaged in idle talk and jesting. Surely "ye have rejected Faith" that is to say surely you have denied haqq with the statements you have made regarding RasulAllah (saw) and those who believe him. "...After ye had accepted it" meaning after you had attested to it and uttered it." (Tafsir)

ulamaa of Islam deal with the topic 'mockery and istihza' under the 'chapters of riddat' -which is the greatest kufr among the types of kufr- due to its importance.

Ibn Qudamah (ra) said: "The one, who swears to Allah, whether having the intention of fun or is serious, will be kafir. The one who mocks Allah, His ayaat, His Messengers and His Books are also the same (in the hukm)." (al-Mughni, Kitabu'l-Murtad, 12/298-299)

Imam Nawawi (ra) said: "The practices (actions) which necessitate kufr are the practices that occur intentionally and mocking the deen. This is clear." (Rawdatu't-Talibin, 10/64)

Qurtubi (ra) quoted the statement of Qadi Ibnu'l-Arabi while he was explaining the situation of those who mock the deen during the war of Tabuk: "Their statements are either serious or idle play. It does not matter how it was, it is still kufr. It is because swearing while joking is also kufr, there is no disagreement among the ulamaa regarding this matter. Researching is the mate of 'ilm and truth; idle play and mockery is the mate of ignorance and baatil." (al-Jami li Ahkamu'l-Qur'an, 8/397)

Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "It is kufr to mock Allah, His ayah, and his Prophet; if the individual who does this had been a mu'min prior (to this mockery) he will be given the hukm kafir." (Fatawa 7/273)

Muhammad b Abdulwahab (ra) named a chapter as "To make mockery of things related to Allah, the Qur'an or the Messenger" in his book 'Kitabu't-Tawhid' meaning "whoever mocks with (any of) this will

be kafir” (Kitabu’t-Tawhid maa sharhihi Fathu’l-Majeed, 520). Muhammad b Abdulwahab (ra) also mentioned the same ruling “Whoever mocks or ridicules any part of the Messenger’s Religion or its rewards or punishments, has committed an act of disbelief.” as the sixth nullifier of Islam. (al-Jamiu’l-Farid, 283)

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) als said: “When RasulAllah (saw) prohibited them to worship shirk they mocked him. As a matter of fact, all mushrik when the messengers call them to tawhid –due to paganism which was beloved to their hearts- they cursed at the messengers and accused them of being foolish and deviated and attributed them with madness. When you come across someone who is like them you will observe that he mocks the one who calls him to tawhid in the same manner.” (Dakaitu’t-Tafsir, 3/332)

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) stated: “It is known that these mocker sarcastic people were destroyed one by one by Allah (awj). The historians and mufassir narrate their stories (of being destroyed). According to the narrations they are among the leaders of Quraish such as; Waled ibn Mughira, al-As ibn Wail, al-Aswadani ibn al-Muttalib, Ibn Abd Yaghus and al-Harith ibn Kays and Kisra who tore up the letter of RasulAllah (saw). Allah (jj) killed Kisra after a short time passed and Allah (swt) smashed his mulk (goods) to smithereens and nothing was left from the governments of Kisra. So this is what happens. Allah knows the best. 'For he who hateth thee, he will be cut off (from Future Hope).' (al-Kawthar 108/3) Therefore things that took place are approved by the ayah in this situation. Allah will cut off the one who shows hatred and enmity towards RasulAllah (saw) and eliminate his name and fame. There is a much known sentence which is spoken very often: ‘The flesh of ulamaa is poisonous (meaning whoever makes their giybah will be destroyed). And you make a judgment regarding the situation of those who make the giybah of the messengers! RasulAllah (saw) said in a hadith which is narrated from him: ‘Whoever shows enmity towards one of my wali, he declares a war against me!’ (Bukhari) When this situation as it is, then what will be the situation of those who show enmity towards the messengers? (Those will be fought against who declare war against Allah)” (as-Sarimu’l-Maslul, 164-165)

1- Nifaq is stable even without Intention and Comprehension

Regarding the following ayah Ibni Taymiyyah (ra) says: “Say: "Was it at Allah, and His Signs, and His Messenger that ye were mocking?" Make ye no excuses: ye have rejected Faith after ye had accepted it.” (at-Tawba 9/65-66) “He had commanded the Prophet say the following to them: Surely you have rejected faith (iman) after you had accepted it. When it comes to the one who says ‘these individuals have become kafir after they had uttered iman with their tongues while carrying kufr in their hearts’ regarding such ayah, this would not be correct. It is because along with the kufr of the heart attesting to iman only by tongue will be accompanied by kufr for this reason it could not be said: After your iman you became kafir furthermore even though in essence they continued to be kafir. If it is said, the intention was the meaning ‘after you showed your iman you showed your kufr’. It will be said that in this state they had not shown this (showing iman and then showing kufr) to any other but distinguished individuals (whom they know) and with them (those special/distinguished individuals) they continued in the same state they had been in. However when they deviated to being munafiq, out of fear that a surah would be revealed to reveal their nifaq, they had uttered the words of mockery, while they had iman previously, later they became kafir. Their words (of mockery) does not point out that they had

still continued their state of nifaq (being munafiq). "O Prophet! Strive against the disbelievers and the hypocrites! Be harsh with them. Their ultimate abode is hell, a hapless journey's end. They swear by Allah that they said nothing (wrong), yet they did say the word of disbelief (kufr), and did disbelieve after their Surrender (to Allah) (iman). And they purposed that which they could not attain, and they sought revenge only that Allah by His messenger should enrich them of His bounty. If they repent it will be better for them; and if they turn away, Allah will afflict them with a painful doom in the world and the Hereafter, and they have no protecting friend nor helper in the earth." (Al Tawbah 9/73-74) As seen here it is stated that "yet they did say the word of disbelief (kufr), and did disbelieve (become kafir) after their Surrender (to Allah) (iman)." (Meaning they did have iman first and after having iman they became kafir with an act of kufr). Their entrance into Islam this way, can be like the badawi arabs had entered Islam. Then there will not be any difference between the mandates of "after their Iman" and "after their Surrender". They could also still be continuing to remain munafiq. In a situation as such it would not be possible to mention the existence of owning partial iman. It is because they had now revealed kufr and also irtidad. Here for this reason in condition that they make tawbah it is stated: "If they repent it will be better for them; and if they turn away..." meaning after repenting if they turn away from their tawbah: "Allah will afflict them with a painful doom in the world and the Hereafter." This clearly is regarding those who openly show their kufr. RasulAllah (saw) will make jihaad with an individual as such thereby performing hadd and punishment. Here for this reason these mandates take place after the mandate of Allah "O Prophet! Strive against the disbelievers and the hypocrites! Be harsh with them" and here again for this reason He (awj) had commanded "Their ultimate abode is hell, a hapless journey's end." The fraction which deviated to kufr after Islam is different from the fraction which deviated to kufr after having iman. It is because after entering Islam those who deviated to kufr, although they had stated the words which made them deviate to kufr, they had sworn by the name of Allah that they had not made such statement and tried to do something they could not attain. This shows that they tried to do something as such, however they could not attain their goal. It can not be said here, that they tried to do something they had not performed. However, it is mentioned that they purposed that which they could not attain. This shows that they had tried to do something like this however they could not attain their goal. It is not stated here that they tried to do something they had not done. However it is mentioned that they could not attain. Regarding this matter both statement and action had occurred from them. Almighty Allah commanded: "And if thou ask them (O Muhammad) they will say: We did but talk and jest." (at-Tawba 9/65) Here they confessed and presented their excuse for this reason it was said: "Make ye no excuses: ye have rejected Faith after ye had accepted it." (at-Tawba 9/66) This shows that what they did was not kufr according to them. On the contrary they thought this was not kufr. This way it was understood that surely mockery (istihza) of Allah, His ayah and Rasul is kufr and the owner of this kufr will be kafir after his iman. This ayah shows that they carried a weak iman but only they performed an act they knew was haraam but thought was not kufr. Whereas in reality it was kufr and they became kafir with this. When it is like this, fundamentally they did not believe what they had done was permissible. Here, many from the salaf have said this regarding the mentioned matter. Regarding these (those with weak iman) an example has been given also in Surat Al Baqarah (17-19). They saw and then became blind. They knew and then denied they had iman and then they did kufr. Like this Qatadah and Mujahid said this example had been given so that they (those with weak iman) would incline towards the mu'min and listen to that which the Rasul brought and go towards their light. (Fatawa 7/272-274)

Regarding the following ayah Imam (r.a) said: “And if thou ask them (O Muhammad) they will say: We did but talk and jest.” (at-Tawba 9/65) This ayah informs us that after they had iman regardless of their statements ‘surely we spoke of things that are kufr without the intention (belief) of it being kufr moreover we did talk but jest’ they fell in kufr. It is understood that mockery of the ayah of Allah is kufr. This can only be in those, who open their hearts to words as such. If there had been iman in the heart, that iman would prevent from talking such things.” (Fatawa 7/220)

It must be taken notice how the nass from Qur’an indicates the kufr of such group. From the nass it is essentially understood that: this hukm comprises all those which perform the same act or the similar and it is not only particular to those mentioned in the ayah. It is because in the nass, the generality of the statement is regarded and not the particularity of the reason. This is something that the mufassir have ittifaq over. Or else the validity of the Qur’an being a universal hujjah would end (wa a’udhu billah). The reason is because in spite of the greatness and highness of the Qur’an there is almost no ayah that did not have a reason to be revealed. Now if the hukm of the ayah is dedicated to that reason there will be no ayah left that’s hukm is binding to us.

Surely in the explanation of this ayah the mufassir had ittifaq that after having iman, with these evil words, they had performed kufr. They had only had ikhtilaf regarding the fact whether their previous iman had not been sincere and had it only been an iman of the tongue or was it an iman of both the heart and the tongue. According to both the probabilities with the fadl of one and only Allah implication is sufficient.

According to the first view: Surely assuming that by uttering those words which make one innocent, an iman is constituted by submitting sincerely, with love, and respect to Allah, His deen and His Rasul they were begun to be given the hukm with the hukm of Islam. Likewise as explained previously the one without iman cannot have Islam and the one without Islam can not have iman. Due to these along with their statements the hukm of Islam was performed on them (they were accepted as Muslim) until they said these evil words. With these words and because of them the hukm of kufr began to be performed over them. This way from being upon iman in the dhahir (apparent) they transferred with certainty in dhahir and batin to be kafir. It is because they had stated these words willingly and had not been coerced to. With this it was understood that they sneakily had opened their breasts to this. In the ayah the following is stated: “Any one who, after accepting faith in Allah, utters Unbelief, - except under compulsion, his heart remaining firm in Faith - but such as open their breast to Unbelief, on them is Wrath from Allah, and theirs will be a dreadful Penalty.” (an-Nahl 16/106)

If there had been iman in their hearts they would have prohibited from saying it. Whoever is to say that this hukm is particular to those prominent among the munafiq, meaning if one is to think ‘we knew their nifaq with this mockery, they did not reject Him (kufr) therefore these signs are not effective and not forceful’ he will be given the following answer:

1- Surely the statement of ‘these words that were uttered do not take part in the giving of the hukm of kufr’ is opposing the nass of the Qur’an: “Make ye no excuses: ye have rejected Faith after ye had accepted it.”

2- Surely the hukm given by the Qur'an was given without any factor, therefore as the real reason it had not mentioned this factor.

3- It is essential in sharee'ah that the wahy has no effect on the carrying out of the hukm until plagued with cloudiness in mind; surely the reliance of this hukm is the dhahir statements and actions.

4- The following ayah "ye have rejected Faith after ye had accepted it." This iman is either the inner iman or only the iman in the dhahir. According to both probabilities istidlal is possible. Surely this tribe had previously been treated as Muslim. After their iman they performed kufr with these evil words. According to this if the tribe had been kafir before, then why did sharee'ah act so late to give them this hukm? Likewise why was this hukm build upon an attribute which is not effective? Moreover if this tribe had not become kafir for the reason informed, why did they apologise after they had said those words?

It is only possible to solve this problem with the understanding of the salafus saliheen. Surely they had made takfir of them for these evil statements. Therefore this hukm is general and imperatively comprises all that performs the same action. The iman mentioned in the ayah whether it is present only in the dhahir or whether it is present in the batin and dhahir it does not matter. Among those who defend this thought Ibn Taymiyyah is the leader. In this tribe previously there had been a weak iman present. Being ignorant without even carrying the belief they had said things such as they did it without knowing it would make them kafir and knowing it is haraam also believing through joking and mockery kufr would not actualise, that kufr only actualised in statements seriously stated likewise believing play and fun was a barrier to prevent kufr like coercion is a barrier. When it is as such the sharee'ah did not deny them playing and having fun. Whereas, it has denied all the deception type claims of the munafiq. Therefore the truth in their claim that with their fun and play they had not been serious and were distant from this aim.

Regardless of all this, the sharee'ah had informed that their statements sourced from their play and fun and in result had made them kafir after they had iman. Here their ignorance had not been excused neither was not intentionally meaning kufr.

Every Muslim who is serious in deen must avoid being thrown into jahannam by stating a careless word. We seek refuge in Allah from this. In the sahih hadith the rasul had said "Mankind will be dragged on their faces with only the harvest their tongues." (Ahmad; Tirmidhi; Ibn Majah)

Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "those who imitate the words of the Jahm and Salihi say: Surely cursing Allah and his Rasul, expressing the trinity and uttering all the kufri words are not in reality kufr in batin. These are only things that are evidence for kufr of the dhahir. For this reason it is permissible that inside (in batin) the individual, who curses and speaks ill, be a muwahhid who knows Allah well and a mu'min who has believed in Him. When these individuals are presented with nass of ijma that this is kufr in dhahir and batin they'll say: This would necessitate denial. Iman would necessitate the opposite of this. It would be said to them there are two evident situations: 1- The one which is absolutely known to be from deen 2- That which we think to be

necessary when we think. (Fatawa 7/557)

Amongst the actions and statements are those on account of which a person exits from Islam and it is not a condition that he desires to leave Islam (qasd), or desires to commit kufr or that he believes in the statement of kufr he uttered.

Ibn Hajar said, "Amongst the Muslims are those who exit the religion without desiring (qasd) to leave the religion and without choosing a religion other than that of Islam" (Fath ul-Baree 12/373)

Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, "And in essence, whoever says or commits that which is disbelief, kufr, disbelieves on account of it, even if he did not desire (lam yaqsud) to become a disbeliever (by the act), since no one desires disbelief except as Allah wills." (As-Saarim al-Maslool 178)

Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said, "Whoever uttered with his tongue a word of disbelief without having any need for it, deliberately saying it, knowing that it is an utterance of disbelief, then he becomes a disbeliever through that both inwardly and outwardly, and we do not make it permissible for it to be said: 'It is possible for him to still be a believer inwardly'..." (Saarim al-Maslool 524)

Shaikh ul-Islam added to the above, in explanation of the verse in Surah Nahl, "Whoever disbelieved in Allah after his belief, except him who is compelled and whose heart is at rest with iman. However, those who open their breasts to disbelief, on them is wrath from Allah, and theirs will be a great torment (an-Nahl 16/106)" - so he said, "And it is known that he did not intend by the disbelief mentioned here, the disbelief that relates to belief (i'tiqad) of the heart only, because a man cannot be compelled with respect to this (i.e. his heart cannot be forced to hold a particular belief, even though he may be forced to say it with his tongue). And He accepted the one who is compelled (to disbelief) but did not mean the one who uttered (disbelief) and believed in what he said, because he accepted the one who is compelled..." (Saarim al-Maslool 524)

In other words, only one who utters disbelief under compulsion is excused, as for the one who utters disbelief, then he has disbelieved, irrespective of whether his heart believed in what he said or not, since although a man can be forced to say something with his tongue, he cannot be forced to accept and believe it with his heart, hence the compulsion being referred to in the verse mentioned above, is the one that is related to the tongue only. Therefore, it is not a condition that when someone utters disbelief, that he also believes in what he uttered for it to be considered disbelief.

2- Whoever speaks alfazl kufr (word of kufr) is kafir in both Dhahir and in Batin

Shaikhul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) said:

"1- Surely we know that without coercion whoever curses Allah and His Rasul moreover whoever utters alfadl kufr without coercion, makes a mockery of Allah, His Rasul and His ayah, this individual is in batin

and in dhahir kafir. Whoever states an individual as such can sometimes be Mu'min in batin and kafir in dhahir, this individual will have made a statement that is necessarily known in deen as fasad (corruption). It is because surely Allah had mentioned the words of the kafir in the Qur'an and had given the hukm of kufr; He had informed that with this they deserve jahannam. If their words of kufr were on the same level of the mistake of those who is mistaken in their shahadah while they were witnessing or on the same level of the mistake of those who is mistaken in their uttering while they uttered; Allah would not have made them ahl jahannam with a probable shahadah of either correct or false. On the contrary He would have required punishing them with the condition that this shahadah is correct. This is like the following ayahs: "They do blaspheme who say: "Allah is Christ the son of Mary." But said Christ: "O Children of Israel! Worship Allah, my Lord and your Lord." Whoever joins other gods with Allah,- Allah will forbid him the garden, and the Fire will be his abode. There will for the wrong-doers be no one to help. They do blaspheme who say: Allah is one of three in a Trinity: for there is no god except One Allah. If they desist not from their word (of blasphemy), verily a grievous penalty will befall the blasphemers among them." (al-Maida 5/72-73) and other similar ayahs.

2- When the heart believes in the truthness of the Rasul and that He is an envoy, if it loves and exalts the Rasul; this condition will prevent from cursing and speaking evil of the Rasul. This is because it is not expected from them, other than that which is sourced from belittling and not appreciating. From this it is understood that the abstract belief that He is haqq, can only become iman by loving Him by heart, and exalting Him. (Fatawa 7/557)

"The Hypocrites are afraid lest a Surah should be sent down about them, showing them what is (really passing) in their hearts. Say: "Mock ye! But verily Allah will bring to light all that ye fear (should be revealed). If thou dost question them, they declare (with emphasis): "We were only talking idly and in play." (At-Tawba 9/64-65)

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) stated following after he mentioned the above ayah: "This is an open nass regarding that it is kufr to mock Allah, His ayah and His Rasul. Above all, cursing is much precedence. This ayah shows whoever, either serious or in jest attributes deficiency to the envoy of Allah (saw) will be kafir." (As-Sarim'ul-Maslul, 28)

When we take notice of the expressions of Ibn Taymiyyah whoever expresses statements that are kufr, without coercion, about the individual who says 'other than batin, this individual will be kafir only in dhahir', in deen ul Islam this individual will have said a word which is known necessarily as corruption (fasad). Now what would he say to the individual who says an individual as such is neither in dhahir nor in batin kafir?

Ibn Taymiyyah states: "This is the madhhab of the general mass of the people of knowledge. Ibn Al-Munthir said: 'The general mass of the people of knowledge have formed consensus upon that the hadd of the one who swears at the Prophet is execution. And from those who said this was Malik, Al-Layth, Ahmad and Ishaq. And it is the madhhab of Ash-Shafi'i He said: "And it is mentioned from An-Nu'man: He is not killed, that which they are upon from shirk is greater." And Abu Bakr Al-Farisi, from the

companions of Ash-Shafii, mentioned the ijma of the Muslims upon that the hadd of the one who swears at the Prophet is execution, just as the hadd of he who swears at other than him is whipping. And this ijma that he mentioned is understood as being the ijma of the first generations from the Sahabah and the tabi'een, or that he meant with that, their ijma upon the one who swears at the Prophet, it is obligatory to kill him if he is a Muslim. And likewise, Al-Qadhi 'Iyyad restricted it, as he said: 'The ummah has formed consensus upon the execution of the one who belittles him or swears at him from the Muslims.' And the Imam Is'haq Ibn Rahuyah, one of the great Imams, said: 'The Muslims have formed consensus upon that whoever swears at Allah, or swears at His Messenger, or rejects anything from that which Allah (awj) revealed, or kills a Prophet from the Prophets of Allah (awj), that he is a kafir due to that, even if he accepts everything that Allah revealed.' And Al-Khattabi said: 'I do not know anyone from the Muslims who differs regarding the obligation of his execution.' And Muhammad Ibn Sahnun said: 'The scholars have formed consensus upon that the one who swears at the Prophet, belittling him, is a kafir, and the threat of the punishment of Allah is upon him, and his ruling according to the ummah is execution, and whoever doubts his kufr and his punishment, then he has disbelieved.' And the clarification of the opinion regarding it, is that the one who swears, if he is a Muslim, then he disbelieves and is executed, without any difference, and it is the madhhab of the four Imams and other than them. And those from the Imams who have mentioned the ijma upon that have past, like Is'haq Ibn Rahuyah and other than him. And if he is a dhimmi, then he is executed also in the madhhab of Malik and the people of al-Madinah, and the mentioning of their phrasings will come. And it is the madhhab of Ahmad and the fuqaha of the Hadith. And Ahmad clearly stated that in many places. Hanbal said: 'I heard Abu Abdullah saying: Everyone who swears at the Prophet or belittles him, whether he is a Muslim or a kafir, then execution is upon him. And I see that he should be executed and not given istitabah.' He said: And I heard Abu Abdullah saying: 'Everyone who breaks the ahd and innovates an innovation in Islam like this, then I see execution upon him, they were not given the ahd and the dhimmah upon this.' And likewise, Abu As-Saqr said: I asked Abu Abdullah about a man from the people of dhimmah who swears at the Prophet, what is upon him? He said: If the Bayyinah is established upon him, then whoever swears at the Prophet is executed, whether he is a Muslim or a kafir.' Both narrated by Al-Khallal. And he said in the narration of Abdullah and Abu Talib, and he was asked about someone who swears at the Prophet, he said: 'He is executed.' It was said to him: 'Are there ahadith regarding it?' He said: 'Yes. ahadith, from them the hadith of the blind man who killed the woman. He said: I heard her swearing at the Prophet. And the hadith of Husayn, that Ibn Umar said: Whoever swears at the Prophet is executed. And Umar Ibn Abdul-Aziz said: He is executed. And that is because whoever swears at the Prophet is a murtadd, and no Muslim swears at the Prophet.' Abdullah added: 'I asked my father about one who swears at the Prophet is he given istitabah?' He said: 'Execution has become obligatory upon him, and he is not given istitabah. Khalid Ibn Al-Walid killed a man who swore at the Prophet and did not give him istitabah.' Both narrated by Abu Bakr in 'Ash-Shafii' And in the narration of Abu Talib: 'Ahmad was asked about the one who swears at the Prophet. He said: He is executed. He has nullified the ahd.' And Harb said: 'I asked Ahmad about a man from the People of dhimmah who swears at the Prophet. He said: He is executed if he swears at the Prophet.' Both narrated by Al-Khallal, and he clearly stated this in other than these answers. So all of his sayings are clear statements regarding the obligation of executing him, and in that he has nullified the ahd, and there is nothing from him different than this. And likewise was mentioned from all of his companions, the earlier and the later of them, they did not disagree on

that.' Surely if the individual who curses is Muslim, he will be made takfir with this and without doubt will be killed. This is the view of the four imam and others." (as-Sarim'ul-Maslul, 5)

"Verily insulting Allah (awj) and insulting RasulAllah (saw) is kufr, outwardly and inwardly. And it is all same if the one who does these insults, believes that this is haraam, or if he believes this action is permissible, or if it is negligence in his creed (it is always considered kufr). This is the madhhab of the fuqaha of all the ahl-sunnah, those who proclaim that iman is statements and actions." (as-Sarim'ul-Maslul, 451)

"...And from the ways of Allah is that in regards to those who harm Allah and His Messenger whom the believers cannot punish, then Allah Himself takes sufficient revenge on behalf of His Messenger. For example, the story of Allah's one-by-one destruction of those who mocked RasulAllah (saw) is well known, as has been mentioned by the scholars of history and tafsir. They were a small group of the heads of Quraysh, including al-Walid bin Mughirah, al-'As bin Wa'il, al-Aswadan bin 'Abd al-Mutallib, Ibn 'Abd Yaghuth, and al-Harith bin Qays. Also, RasulAllah (saw) wrote to Kisra (the king of Persia) and Caesar (the king of Rome), while neither of them had entered into Islam. However, Caesar respected the letter of RasulAllah (saw), and treated his ambassador in a fine manner, so his kingdom was kept for him, and this is why it was said: 'His kingdom remains for him among his descendents until today.' As for Kisra, he tore the letter of RasulAllah (saw) into pieces and mocked him. As a result, Allah caused Kisra to be killed soon after, and caused his kingdom to be torn into pieces, and there did not remain for any of the future Kisras any kingdom, and this – and Allah knows best – is in accordance with the phrase 'the flesh of the scholars is poisonous.' So, how would it be with the flesh of the Prophets (saw)? And in the 'Sahih,' it is narrated: 'Allah (awj) says: 'Whoever declares his enmity to a close ally of Mine, then I declare war on him.' So, how would it be in the case of the one who declares his enmity to the Prophets? Whoever Allah declares war upon, then he will no doubt be fought! If you read the stories of the Prophets mentioned in the Qur'an, then you will find that their people were destroyed the moment they began harming their Prophets by throwing at them the nastiest of words and actions. This is how the Children of Israel had humiliation thrown upon them, and this is how they earned the anger of Allah, and they had nobody to help them against Him – all of this, because they killed the Prophets without any right, in addition to their disbelief, as Allah mentioned in His Book. And you will not find anybody who ever harmed a Prophet from the Prophets - and did not repent from this – except that Allah would strike him with some type of calamity or disaster soon after. And we have previously mentioned the efforts of the Muslims in hastening their punishment of the disbelievers, who insulted RasulAllah (saw), and we mentioned many different examples of this, and this is a wide door of discussion that cannot be mentioned here in its entirety. An example of this is what has been mentioned regarding a huge group of the Muslims in our times, when they were laying siege to the fortresses and cities of the Romans on the Syrian coast. They said: 'We used to lay siege to the castle or city for a month or more without being able to penetrate it. As soon as we would hear that its people began insulting RasulAllah (saw) and attacking his honour, our victory over them was suddenly and miraculously made quick and easy, and would not come beyond a day or two afterwards. The gates of the area would open, and we would proceed to attack them severely. We would be extremely happy with this speedy victory when we heard their slander of him (peace be upon him), despite our hearts being filled with rage because of what they

had said.' And similar accounts were narrated from our trustworthy companions from Morocco, as their incidents with the Christians there were similar. So, from the ways of Allah is that He (jj) sometimes punishes His enemies with a torment of His own, and He (jj) sometimes does so at the hands of His believing servants." (as-Sarim al-Maslul 'ala Shatim ar-Rasul 2/233)

Imam Malik ibn Anas (ra) said "Any Muslim who curses RasulAllah (saw) is killed without being asked to repent." (Sahnoon 'al Mudawwanatul Kubra', Al U'tbi 'al U'tbiyyah', Qadi I'yaad 'ash Shifa bi Ta'rif Huqooq Mustafaa') Imam Ibn Abi Zayd al Qayrawaani (ra) said "If someone speaks disrespectfully of RasulAllah (saw) he should be put to death without accepting his repentance. If someone from a tolerated class speaks disrespectfully of him, aside from simply expressing his disbelief, he should be put to death unless he becomes a Muslim." (Al Qayrawani 'ar Risaalah' 173) Imam Ibn Hazm (ra) said "A person who insults Allah (swt) or any of His prophets is a disbeliever and must be executed without mercy or compensation." (Ibn Hazm 'al Muhalla' XI, 2308) Imam Ibn al Qaasim said "Anyone who curses him, reviles him, finds fault with him or disparages him is killed. The community says that he should be killed just like the dualist. Allah made it obligatory to respect the Prophet and be dutiful to him." He also said "Any Jew or Christian who curses the Prophets in any way other than that by which he normally disbelieves is beheaded unless he becomes Muslim." (Al U'tbi 'al Utibiyyah', Qadi Iyad 'ash Shifa bi Ta'rif Huqooq Mustafaa' 374; 439) Imam Sahnoon said about those who curse RasulAllah (saw) "This is apostacy in exactly the same way as zandaqah is. Therefore there is some dispute about whether such a person should be called to repent (as a Muslim) or whether he is a disbeliever. Is he to be killed by a hadd punishment (as a Muslim) or for disbelief?" (Qadi Iyad 'ash Shifa bi Ta'rif Huqooq Mustafaa' 374) Imam ibn al Mundhir Qadi I'yad said "Abu Bakr ibn al Mundhir said that the bulk of the people of knowledge agree that whoever curses RasulAllah (saw) is killed." (Qadi Iyad 'ash Shifa bi Ta'rif Huqooq Mustafaa' [p.373]) Shaykh Abu'l Hasan al Qaabisi said "When a person's curse (of a prophet) is proven and then he repents of what he has done and shows his repentance, he is killed for the curse as a hadd punishment." (Qadi Iyad 'ash Shifa bi Ta'rif Huqooq Mustafaa' 402) Qaadi I'yad said "Know that all who curse Muhammad (saw), or blame him or attributes imperfection to him in his person, his lineage, his deen or any of his qualities, or alludes to that or its like by any means whatsoever, whether in the form of a curse or contempt or belittling him or detracting from him or finding fault with him or maligning him, the judgment regarding such a person is the same the judgement against anyone who curses him. He is killed as we will make clear. This judgment extends to anything which amounts to a curse or a disparagement. We have no hesitation concerning this matter, be it a clear statement or allusion. The same applies to anyone who curses him, invokes against him, desires to harm him, ascribes to him what does not befit his position or jokes about his mighty affair with foolish talk, satire, disliked words or lies, or reviles him because of any affliction or trial which happened to him or disparages him, because of any of the permissible and well-known human events which happened to him. All of this is the consensus of the u'lamaa and the Imaams of fatwa from the time of the sahabah until today." (Qadi Iyad 'ash Shifa bi Ta'rif Huqooq Mustafaa' 373) Sidi Khaleel said concerning issues which break the contract of protection for the dhimmi [the non-Muslim living in Dar al Islam] "Insults a prophet with slander over and above what constitutes his disbelief...he should be put to death unless he embraces Islam." (Khaleel 'al Mukhtasar') Imam Ibn Naqeeb al Misri said "When a person who has reached puberty and is sane, voluntarily apostatizes from Islam, he deserves to be killed....(and he included the following as

apostacy:-) ...to revile Allah or His Messenger..." (Ibn Naqeeb al Misri 'U'mdat as Saalik wa U'ddat an-Naasik' Kitaab al Jinayaat [p.596-597])

This is the hukm for the one who curses Allah, His ayah and His Envoy. We take refuge in Allah from this. Before going on to another issue, in order to prevent doubts it would be beneficial to touch upon the following:

Surely stating the words of kufr (alfadl kufr) is kufr in both dhahir and batin even if its owner did not intend kufr. However if the individual does not know the meaning of the word and utters it because this individuals intention was not that which necessitates kufr he will not be made takfir of. The reason is because this individual with his word which is under consideration did not intend the kufr meaning of his word. It is like the following example: If an individual says raina to the Nabi (saw) meaning listen to us, this individual will not be made takfir of. However if he says raina to criticize, to condemn (wal a'udhu billah) even if this individual does not know this is kufr and did not intend (kufr) in dhahir and batin he will be made takfir of.

This is why we can come across words from the ulamaa similar the following: Whoever speaks kufr or performs kufr he will be made takfir of even if he does not intend this. For this reason the slave of Allah should not utter a word without knowing its meaning or interpretation that may take him to the pleasure or displeasure of Allah.

Abu Hurayrah heard RasulAllah say: "A slave of Allah may utter a word without thinking whether it is right or wrong. He may slip down in the fire as far away a distance equal to that between the east and west." (Bukhari) Abu Hurayrah narrated RasulAllah said: "A slave (of Allah) may utter a word which pleases Allah without giving it much importance and because of that Allah will raise him to degrees (of reward); a slave (of Allah) may utter a word (carelessly) which displeases Allah without thinking of its gravity and because of that he will be thrown to the hell fire." (Bukhari & Muslim)

Ibn Taymiyyah states: "Hafidh states: 'An individual who hears something which can not be understood, in other words, the meaning for him is not cared for, and is not requested. The meaning is not set in his mind or is not even thought to be set, however it will be used when he sees the need to.' Shayh Izzeddeen b. Abdussalam states: 'This is something the one stated can not differentiate the good or bad of it. For this reason it is haraam for a human to speak of that which he can not distinguish the beautiful from the ugly.' Nawawi states 'In this hadith there is encouragement to protect the tongue. According to this the one who wishes to speak must think of what he is going to say before speaking. If he sees benefit in himself he will speak or else he'll keep quite.' It is understood in these statements that before making a statement the individual must examine the meaning and concept as he must stay away from that which he cannot distinguish beautiful from ugly. And this is a must." (As Sarim'ul Maslul, 154)

Ibn Taymiyyah states: "In summary, whoever states anything that is kufr or performs the action without the intention of becoming a kafir, for this reason he will become kafir. Because no one can intend kufr other than those Allah wished." (as Sarim'ul Maslul)

Sometimes they say: as long as the individual does not intend kufr he will not be made takfir of. Their intention with this is the meaning which the kufr is incumbent (tarattub) upon; it is not kufr per se. It is because as shaikh (ra) stated 'no one can intend kufr other than those Allah wished.'

To illustrate this point, a person may prostrate to an idol and this act in and of itself is kufr that expels from the religion. However, it is not a condition that a person "intended to perform kufr" by this act, before he is judged a disbeliever, since the mushriks who worship the dead and make supplication to them, believing that the dead provide for them and protect them, they never "intend to perform kufr" by these acts, rather they consider them to be worship and nearness to Allah, yet they are the greatest of acts of shirk and apostasy.

To illustrate with another example, a person who mocks and reviles Allah (awj) or RasulAllah (saw), it is not required that the person "desired kufr" by his words of mockery or revilement, and neither is it a condition that he "believed (i'tiqaad) in what he said" before takfir is made of him. Rather, if he said these words deliberately, intending to say these words, desiring to say these words, then that in and of itself is the kufr that expels from the religion. However, there is a difference between "desiring the act" and "desiring kufr". The latter, "desiring kufr" is of no significance and its presence or absence has no bearing on the ruling of takfir (in those cases where the action is major kufr that expels from the religion -If a person desired kufr in his heart, then he would become a disbeliever through that, regardless of whether he performed an act of kufr or not.-) However, the former, "having desired the act", meaning that a person willfully did the act, then this does have a bearing on the ruling of takfir, for this is related to the preventative barriers and required conditions for the performance of takfir, in the sense that it must be verified that this act did not occur out of compulsion, or error and the likes.

Ibn Qayyim said, "It has preceded that the one who uttered, when he found his lost camel, "O Allah, you are my servant and I am your Lord" erred due to extreme joy and he did not disbelieve by these words, even though he uttered pure and clear kufr. This is because he did not intend to say it. And the one who is compelled to utter kufr, has indeed spoken with a word of kufr, but he does not become a disbeliever since he did not desire to utter this word, as opposed to the one who mocks or jests (about Allah, the Messenger, or the religion). In this case, such an utterance would necessitate disbelief and divorce, even if he was only joking and fooling around, since he desired to utter these words (qasidun littakallum bil-lafdh). And even if he was just joking, then this would be no excuse for him, as opposed to the case of the one who is compelled, or who erred, or who was forgetful. Such a one is excused. A person who is forced to say something is excused, and what he said may be deemed as allowable, but the one who jokes is not allowed to utter in jest words of kufr or of divorce. When he said the words, he meant to say them, and he cannot claim that he was forced or that he made a mistake or said it out of forgetfulness or ignorance. Allah and His Messenger do not accept joking as an excuse that will ward off the punishment; indeed, the one who jokes is more deserving of punishment. Do you not see that Allah accepts the excuse of the person who is forced to speak words of kufr if his heart is filled with true faith, but He does not accept any excuse from the one who jokes. On the contrary, He says: "If you ask them (about this), they declare: 'We were only talking idly and joking.' Say: 'Was it at Allah, and His Ayaat

(proofs, evidences, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.) and His Messenger that you were mocking?” Make no excuse; you disbelieved after you had believed” (at-Tawbah 9/65-66)” (I’lam al-Muwaqqi’een, 3/63)

Regarding the matter of ignorance not being an excuse Muhammad b. Abdul Wahhab had been asked a few questions... His answer to the question ‘takfir will not be made on him if he speaks of a kufr speech which he has no knowledge of’ does this mean if he has no knowledge of its meaning or that he will not be a kafir?’ is as follows:

“If an individual speaks of the kufr which he does not know this clearly means he has spoken what he has no knowledge of. When it comes to the fact if it will make him a kafir this ayah will be sufficient for him to understand: ‘Make ye no excuses: ye have rejected Faith after ye had accepted it...’ (At-Tawba 9/66) With the belief they had not become kafir they had presented an excuse to the prophet. It is amazing how individuals give this ayah the second meaning. Whereas they hear these words of Allah: ‘Those whose efforts have been wasted in this life, while they thought that they were acquiring good by their works?’ (Al-Kahf 18/104) ‘Some He hath guided: Others have (by their choice) deserved the loss of their way; in that they took the evil ones, in preference to Allah, for their friends and protectors, and think that they receive guidance.’ (Al-Araf 7/30) ‘Such (evil ones) really hinder them from the Path, but they think that they are being guided aright!’ (Az-Zukhruf 43/37) Now do these people think those referred to in the ayah have not become kafir? But only the individual who is in open ignorance will not question and learn these matters!” (Tarih'u Najd al-Mas'ala 16, 447)

Shaikh ul-Islam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhab also stated: “And it is also said that those about whom Allah said, ‘They swear by Allah that they said nothing (bad), but really they said the word of disbelief, and they disbelieved after accepting Islam’ (at-Tawbah 9/74), have you not heard (for yourself) that Allah declared them kuffar by a mere word they uttered, alongside their being from the time of RasulAllah (saw), and their having fought alongside him (in Jihaad), prayed with him, given zakah, made hajj and singled out Allah in Tawhid? And likewise those about whom Allah said, ‘Say: ‘Was it at Allah, and His Ayat and His Messenger that you were mocking?’ Make no excuse; you have disbelieved after you had believed.’ (At-Tawbah 9:65-66). So those who were with RasulAllah (saw) in the expedition of Tabuk, and about whom Allah made it clear that they disbelieved after having faith, they uttered a word and then they mentioned that they only said it in jest (i.e. mockery). Then it has to be clear that the one who proclaims statements of kufr and acts on them -just because he fears a reduction in his sustenance or some harm from people (which does not reach the level of ikrah/coercion)- then this one is worse than the one who did so just jokingly.” (Kashf ush-Shubuhaat)

c- Ascribing the Ayahs which had been revealed regarding the Kuffar to those (Muslim) who perform the same actions

It attracts attention that Muhammad b. Abdulwahhab had ascribed those ayahs which had been revealed for the original kuffar to the Muslim who had performed the same actions. When he came to the conclusion from these ayahs (ihtijaj) he is actually rejecting those who claim that these ayahs are

regarding only the kuffar and not the Muslim. When they make this claim they also wrongfully make istidlal of the words of the salaf which they had used to condemn the Khawaarij. They claim: "the Khawaarij had ascribed the ayah revealed for the kuffar to the Muslim" although this is a correct establishment, the difference between the two is that the ayah the Khawaarij made ihtijaj (to come to a conclusion) was the ayahs regarding haqimiyyah. These ayahs had been revealed regarding those from among the ahl kitab who had extended their filthy hands to try and change the sharee'ah. They had changed the punishment Allah had fixed regarding fornication and replaced it with another type of punishment. This way with the nass from the Qur'an they associated themselves as partners to Allah.

"What! have they partners (in godhead), who have established for them some religion without the permission of Allah?" (Ash-Shura 42/21)

The Qur'an had given the hukm kafir to them for this evil act of theirs and not because they had been ahl kitab. (This attribute -ahl kitab- will not be a bad characteristic and a hukm can not be built upon it) On the contrary as informed in many ayahs in the Qur'an a group from among them had been distant from ifrat (excess/ exaggeration) and tafrit (shortage). If the Qur'an had accepted them to be kafir only because they had been ahl kitab in this case there would have been a contradiction. We seek refuge in Allah from this. However the reason for their kufr was their evil actions.

When the situation is like this the Khawaarij came and performed these nass on Abu Musa al Ashari (ra) and 'Amr b. al As (ra) (while they had given hukm with Qur'an regarding the blood of the Muslimeen in the name of Ali (ra) and Muawiya (ra).) They had said: They had given hukm to people whereas Allah said: "If any do fail to judge by (the light of) what Allah hath revealed, they are (no better than) Unbelievers." (al-Maida 5/44)

By this means they had given the hukm of kufr to Ali, Muawiya and those who befriended them. The salaf had rejected this and said: They tried to ascribe the ayah regarding the kuffar to the Muslimeen. Therefore it is haqq to reject them. It is because the Khawaarij had suited the ayah which had been revealed regarding the kuffar to the acts (performances) which had not been the sort of act they had performed.

Nevertheless whoever ascribes the ayah which had been revealed regarding the kuffar to those from the Muslimeen who perform the action (of kufr) they had performed; When it comes to ascribing this ayah now in comparison where is this and where is the previous?

This has been accepted in mutawaatir in the books of the ulamaa. Regarding the following ayah Ibn Qayyim had stated: "'Say: 'Call upon other (gods) whom ye fancy, besides Allah: They have no power,- not the weight of an atom,- in the heavens or on earth: No (sort of) share have they therein, nor is any of them a helper to Allah. "No intercession can avail in His Presence, except for those for whom He has granted permission. So far (is this the case) that, when terror is removed from their hearts (at the Day of Judgment, then) will they say, 'what is it that your Lord commanded?' they will say, 'That which is true and just; and He is the Most High Most Great'." (Saba 34/22-23) The Qur'an is filled with the precedent

and similar of this ayah. Only most of the people do not know that today's incidents are also in the scope of these ayahs, without the comprehension that they (the ayah) also indirectly cover these (incidents) and suppose the hukm does not continue. Likewise they think these narrated incidents are taken place in the past in a type and tribe and that they have not left heirs. Here in fact this is the barrier that comes between the slave (the understanding of the individual) and the comprehension of the Qur'an. By Allah even if they have come and gone, their likes maybe even more shar (evil) and even much different have become their heirs. The Qur'an taking them in hand is just like taking the others in hand." (Madarij)

However the situation is just like 'Umar ibn al-Khattab (ra) had said: "In Islam when those appear, who do not know of jahiliyyah, the purity of Islam will begin to perish one by one." (Madarij us Salikin 1/351)

"Say: "Shall we tell you of those who lose most in respect of their deeds?- "Those whose efforts have been wasted in this life, while they thought that they were acquiring good by their works?" (al-Kahf 18/103-104)

Ibn Kathir: "Al-Bukhari recorded from 'Amr that Mus'ab who said: 'I asked my father - meaning Sa'd bin Abi Waqqas - about Allah's saying, 'Say: 'Shall We tell you the greatest losers in respect of (their) deeds' 'Are they the Haruriyyah' He said, 'No, they are the Jews and Christians. As for the Jews, they disbelieved in Muhammad, and as for the Christians, they disbelieved in Paradise and said that there is no food or drink there, and the Haruriyyah are those who break Allah's covenant after ratifying it.' Sa'd used to call them Al-Fasiqin (the corrupt). 'Ali bin Abi Talib, Ad-Dahhak and others said: "They are the Haruriyyah,' so this means, that according to Ali (ra) this Ayah includes the Haruriyyah just as it includes the Jews, the Christians and others. This does not mean that the Ayah was revealed concerning any of these groups in particular; it is more general than that, because the Ayah was revealed in Makkah, before the Qur'an addressed the Jews and Christians, and before the Khawarij existed at all. So the Ayah is general and refers to everyone who worships Allah in a way that is not acceptable, thinking that he is right in doing that and that his deeds will be accepted, but he is mistaken and his deeds will be rejected, as Allah says: 'Some faces, that Day will be humiliated. Laboring, weary. They will enter in the hot blazing Fire.' (al-Ghashiya 88/2-4) 'And We shall turn to whatever deeds they did, and We shall make such deeds as scattered floating particles of dust.' (Furqan 25/23) 'As for those who disbelieved, their deeds are like a mirage in a desert. The thirsty one thinks it to be water, until he comes up to it, he finds it to be nothing.' (an-Nur 24/ 39) And in this Ayah Allah says: 'Say: 'Shall We tell you...' meaning, 'Shall We inform you;' 'the greatest losers in respect of (their) deeds' Then Allah explains who they are, and says: 'Those whose efforts have been wasted in this life' meaning, they did deeds that do not count, deeds that are not in accordance with the prescribed way that is acceptable to Allah. 'while they thought that they were acquiring good by their deeds' means, they thought that there was some basis for their deeds and that they were accepted and loved.' They are those who deny the Ayat of their Lord and the meeting with Him.' they denied the signs of Allah in this world, the proofs that He has established of His Oneness and of the truth of His Messengers, and they denied the Hereafter. "and on the Day of Resurrection, We shall assign no weight for them" means, 'We will not make their balance heavy because it is empty of any goodness.' Al-Bukhari recorded that Abu Hurayrah (ra) said that RasulAllah (saw) said: 'A huge fat man will come forward on the Day of Resurrection and he will weigh

no more than the wing of a gnat to Allah. Recite, if you wish: 'and on the Day of Resurrection, We shall assign no weight for them' It was also recorded by Muslim." "That shall be their recompense, Hell; because they disbelieved' means, 'We will punish them with that because of their disbelief and because they took the signs and RasulAllah as a joke, mocking them and disbelieving them in the worst way.' (Tafsir)

Regarding this Tabari had said: "Regarding this ayah the most proper word to narrate according to us is: Surely with the ayah 'Say: 'Shall we tell you of those who lose most in respect of their deeds?' (Al-Kahf 18/103) Allah (jj) had meant: Every individual who performs an amal, will reckon he is (his action is) appropriate and with this act he had performed obedience which will gain him the rida (pleasure) of Allah. Whereas, with this act; he will gain the wrath of Allah and thus deviate from the path of iman. Just like the clergy, priests and those others who fell in dalalah (heresy) in their ijtihaad. Regardless of their performance of this act and ijtihaad whatever deen they are from, they are kuffar. 'Those whose efforts have been wasted in this life, while they thought that they were acquiring good by their works?' (al-Kahf 18/104) Meaning the acts they perform in their lives in dunya they are individuals who are not upon hidayah and guidance they are upon sin and heresy. This is because: they had done things other than that which Allah had commanded them, moreover when they had been commanded they pose an attitude of a denier to these commands. 'while they thought that they were acquiring good by their works?; meaning they with these acts of theirs believe they are obedient to Allah. Also they claim they make ijtihaad regarding the matters He (jj) called upon His servants to do. This is the most open evidence to the error of those who claim the following: 'No other than those who decide to (perform) kufr after having awareness of the wahdaniyyah of Allah can be made takfir of'. It is because in this ayah Allah (jj) had narrated their attributes in the following method: 'Those whose efforts have been wasted in this life, while they thought that they were acquiring good by their works' Likewise He states: These are the ones who deny the ayah of their Rabb. The truth is, if the claim 'an individual will only be denying Allah while aware' had been correct as said in this situation the acts of the tribe which Allah had mentioned them as 'they thought that they were acquiring good by their works' would have been appropriate and it would be necessary that they be rewarded for this. However the reality is contrary to their claim. It is because Allah (jj) mentions them as those who deny and whose deeds are wasted." (Tafsir)

Qurtubi had stated: "Say: 'Shall we tell you of those who lose most in respect of their deeds?' (al-Kahf 18/103) This has an indication to this: There are some people who perform acts with the belief that they are doing good however all their efforts have gone to waste. The reason all their efforts have gone to waste is due to either a distorted i'tiqaad or imposing appearance. What had been meant here is kufr." (Tafsir)

As seen here these are open and clear narrations from the ulamaa regarding the ascribing of those ayahs which had been revealed for the original kuffar to those Muslim who perform the same acts.

3.2 Evidence from the Sunnah regarding ignorance not being a barrier in performing irtidat

a- The hukm of objecting the hukm of RasulAllah (saw)

Here we will take in hand some hadith and their explanations.

First evidence: After Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) mentions hadith regarding the Khawaarij he states: "One of them is this hadith that was narrated in Dalail of Ibn Abu Asim and Abu asShayh with a sahih sanad from Qatadah and him from Ukba b. Wassaj and him from Ibn Umar: "RasulAllah (saw) brought treasure of gold and silver and divided it among his sahabah. One from the desert came and said: O Muhammad wallahi if Allah ordered you to be just I do not find you just. RasulAllah replied: Shame on you! Who else can be more just then I? When the man left he (saw) said: Bring him to me calmly. (Tajrid Sarih, Muslim) And there is this statement from the Ansari who was trialed with Zubayr regarding watering Harra: Al-Bukhari recorded that `Urwah said, "Az-Zubayr quarreled with a man about a stream which both of them used for irrigation. Allah's Messenger said to Az-Zubayr 'O Zubayr! Irrigate (your garden) first, and then let the water flow to your neighbor.' The Ansari became angry and said, 'O Allah's Messenger! Is it because he is your cousin' On that, the face of Allah's Messenger changed color (because of anger) and said, (Irrigate (your garden), O Zubayr, and then withhold the water until it reaches the walls (surrounding the palms). Then, release the water to your neighbor.) So, Allah's Messenger gave Az-Zubayr his full right when the Ansari made him angry. Before that, Allah's Messenger had given a generous judgment, beneficial for Az-Zubayr and the Ansari. Az-Zubayr said, 'I think the following verse was revealed concerning that case, Likewise a hadith of the man he gave hukm over is the following: Al-Hafidh Abu Ishaq Ibrahim bin `Abdur-Rahman bin Ibrahim bin Duhaym recorded that Damrah narrated that two men took their dispute to the Prophet, and he gave a judgment to the benefit of whomever among them had the right. The person who lost the dispute said, "I do not agree." The other person asked him, "What do you want then" He said, "Let us go to Abu Bakr As-Siddiq." They went to Abu Bakr and the person who won the dispute said, "We went to the Prophet with our dispute and he issued a decision in my favor." Abu Bakr said, "Then the decision is that which RasulAllah issued." The person who lost the dispute still rejected the decision and said, "Let us go to `Umar bin Al-Khattab." When they went to `Umar, the person who won the dispute said, "We took our dispute to the Prophet and he decided in my favor, but this man refused to submit to the decision." `Umar bin Al-Khattab asked the second man and he concurred. `Umar went to his house and emerged from it holding aloft his sword. He struck the head of the man who rejected the Prophet's decision with the sword and killed him. Among the hadith there are many which could be mentioned one after another. For instance the maruf hadith which is narrated from Bahz b. Hakim and him from his father: The brother of his comes to the Nabi (saw) and says: Surely people are claiming that you have restricted the people from fay and made it halaal for yourself. RasuAllah (saw) said: If I am doing that this belongs to me. There is nothing for them from this. Let them go. (Abu Dawud with a sahih sanad) Even though this is nothing but slander, here it has been meant that he is vilified and thus, this way he is left to suffer. The reason is because he had not told this claim to reject those who stated it; his action was a type of cursing. Likewise the hadith from Ibn Ishaq from Hisham and him from his father and him from Aisha: RasulAllah (saw) bought a camel from an Arab in payment for one wasq of date from zahira. He came home with it and asked for the date but could not find it. Then he went to the Arab and said: O slave of Allah surely we purchased you camel

for one wasq of dates from zahira. However we accounted it (the dates) with us (we thought we had it). However we could not find it. The Arab said 'O I have been betrayed! I have been betrayed!' Upon this people prod him and said are you saying this about RasulAllah? Upon this RasulAllah (saw) said: Give it up (let the deal/camel go)...

Ibn Abi Asim and Ibn Hbban narrated in Dalail. Those which have been explained in this bab are those types which necessitate death. With this individuals become kafir and munafiq whose blood is halaal. RasulALLah (saw) and other Nabi forgave those who did things as such and treated them with tolerance by embracing the following ayah: "Keep to forgiveness (O Muhammad), and enjoin kindness, and turn away from the ignorant." (Araf 7/199) This hadith informs those who RasulAllah (saw) forgave for insulting him: Abu Hurayrah (ra) stated: An Arab came to RasulAllah (saw). He wanted help from him (saw) regarding a matter. He (saw) gave it to him (helped him). And said: did I do you good as necessitated? The Arab said: No also you did no good. Upon this the Muslim were angered and walked towards him. RasulAllah signed to them requesting they leave it alone. Later he got up and went to his house. He sent a messenger to the Arab and invited him to his home. He gave him (what he needed) and made him happy. And said: Surely you came to us and requested from us and we gave it to you. When it is like this you said what you did. For this reason in the hearts of the Muslim there is resentment towards you. If you want, say in front of them what you said to me so that the bad feeling in their hearts goes away. He said alright. When the next day or night came and when he came RasulAllah (saw) said: Surely your friend came and requested help and we gave it to him. When it is as such he said what he did. We invited him to our home and gave it to him; upon this he informed that he was happy. O Arab is this true? The Arab said: Yes May Allah give you khair in return. Nabi (saw) said: Surely the situation between me and this Arab is like this example: A man had a camel. This camel began to disobey him. People went after this camel. This only increased the enmity of the camel. The owner of the camel called upon them and said stop coming between my camel and I surely I will be more gentile with him (then you). The owner of the camel came towards him, gathered some sticks from the ground and showed them to it and it (the camel) came. He sat the camel, tied his back (hump) tightly and sat on it. Now if I had let you when that man said what he did, you would have killed him and he would have went to jahannam. With the same sanad Abu Ahmad Al Askari narrated: An Arab came to the Nabi saying harsh things such as: O Muhammad give me some surely you are not giving from your own property nor your fathers property. Upon this the sahabah got up towards him saying: O the enemy of Allah! Are you saying this to RasulAllah? From all of this it is understood that, it was permissible to kill that man prior to his tawbah. With these words he had become kafir. If it had not been like this he would not go to jahannam being killed after uttering these words. On the contrary it would be necessary that he entered jannah for being oppressed and martyred. Like this the one who killed him should enter jahannam. The reason is because he would have killed a mu'min. However the Nabi (saw) informed it was not permissible to kill him; to shed blood for unrighteous reasons is one of the greatest sins. Likewise this Arab was Muslim, upon this RasulAllah (saw) had used the expression your friend. Let alone for this reason the Arab requested help. If he had been a muharib kafir (a kafir that was fought against) he would not have come to request any help. If RasulAllah had given it so that he becomes Muslim in this hadith it would have been mentioned that he became Muslim. Whereas there is no evidence in the hadith that he entered Islam. On the contrary the crookedness of the Arab is described and his situation is explained as in this ayah: "And among them are men who slander thee in the matter of (the

distribution of) the alms: if they are given part thereof, they are pleased, but if not, behold! They are indignant!" (at-Tawba 9/58) (as-Sarim'ul-Maslul, 201-205)

Regarding the hadith 'Because he was the son of your paternal aunt' Hafidh says: "Surely RasulAllah (saw) did not punish those involved due to their gossip. Just like he said regarding many munafiq: 'So that people will not say Muhammad (saw) is killing his friends.' (Muslim) Qurtubi said: 'If from anyone anything like this happens regarding the Nabi (saw) or His sharee'ah they will be killed like the zindeeq.' Nawawi had narrated the similar from the ulamaa. Wallahu alim." (Fath'ul Bari, Kitab'ushShurbi wal Musakat)

Ibn Qayyim after explaining that the one who curses the Prophet becomes kafir and murtad, he continues to say: "Be just to him. Hence when it comes to the one who says 'you do not seek justice' it is said: to the one who abandons the one who says 'you restrict arrogance yet you keep it to yourself', to the one the who says 'the pleasure of Allah was not sought in this division', to the one who says 'you gave it to him because he was the son of your paternal aunt' it is said haqq (the right) belonged to RasulAllah (saw). If he wanted he would take it, if he wanted he would leave it. For those after him RasulAllah (saw) did not have the right to abandon taking what is his right." (Zad'ul Maad 3/214)

1- The hukm regarding the one who slanders the Prophet

Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "The thirteenth sunnah regarding the hukm of the one who slanders the Prophet. It is what we narrated from Abu'l Kasim Abdullah ibn Muhammad al Baghawi: It came to the Prophet that someone said to a tribe the following: Surely the Prophet (saw) commanded me to give hukm as such and such with my own opinion over you and your properties. This man had wanted a girl (to marry) from them in their ignorance era however they had not married him (to her). Later he went to the girl. Upon this that tribe sent a messenger to RasulAllah (saw) (to inform him). RasulAllah said: Enemy of Allah! he has lied. And sent a man and said: If you find him alive, kill him. If you find him dead burn him. The man left and went. He had found the man (liar), an animal had stung him and he died at that instant. The man burnt him. At this time. RasulAllah (saw) said: Whoever intentionally lies in my name should prepare his place in jahannam. Abu Ahmad b. Adi, had narrated this hadith in his book named al Kamil. From Abu Burayda and he from his father it has been narrated that: Two miles from Madinah there had been an area in Banu Lays. A man had requested a girl (to marry) from them in his ignorance. However they had not given the girl and had not married him. Although he had a hulla on him he came to them and said surely RasulAllah (saw) dressed me in this hulla and commanded me to give hukm regarding your properties and your lives. Later he left and went to the woman he loved. The tribe sent a messenger to RasulAllah (saw). RasulAllah (saw) said: "The enemy of Allah has lied." Later he (saw) sent a man and said to him: If you find him alive –although I do not believe you will find him alive- behead him. If you find him dead burn him. The statement of RasulAllah "However knowing lies on my behalf should prepare his place in jahannam" according to the conditions of sahih the isnad is sahih. We do not know of any illah (defect) regarding this. People have two views regarding this hadith. 1-Those who act upon the dhahir of these nass (evidences) regarding the killing of the one who intentionally lies regarding RasulAllah. Those who say with this act he has become kafir are among this group. A jamaa'ah

has defended this view. Abu Muhammad Al Juwayni is among them. Ibn Ukayl, Shayhi Abu'l Fadl al Hamdani had narrated that the bid'ah doers of Islam, the liars and those who fabricate hadith are worse than those mulhid who are deniers. The mulhid are those who intend to corrupt the deen from the outside. These (liars) intend to corrupt the deen from the inside. For this reason they are like the society of a city who tries to corrupt their own state within. The mulhid are like those who come there to besiege, and those inside are the ones who open the castle doors. In reality these are those who are much dangerous than the ones who had not dressed in Islamic attire. The essence of this view is the following: Surely lying in his (saw) name is lying in the name of Allah. For this reason He has stated: "Surely lying on my behalf is not like lying on behalf of another among you". Surely what RasulAllah (saw) commands Allah (awj) has commanded him (saw) to. As it is necessary to obey the commands of Allah it is obligatory to obey Him. Just like it is necessary to attest to that which Allah had informed... It is a must to attest to what He had informed. As known whoever lies in the name of Allah, claiming he is the envoy of Allah or the nabi of Allah or that he has brought news from Allah and whoever lies just like those who claim to be nabi like Musaylama and al-Unsa etc. surely is a kafir whose blood is halaal. The one who lies in the name of RasulAllah is just like this also. This shows that lying in His name is equivalent to denying Him. For this reason Allah had mentioned both together in the same ayah: "And who does more wrong than he who invents a lie against Allah or rejects the Truth when it reaches him?" (al-Ankaboot 29/68) Moreover in some cases those who lie on His behalf is committing a greater sin than the one who is denying Him. Fundamentally Allah had begun the ayah with this. This is just like the one who attests to Him who attests to what he has brought is much greater than others. Now if the liar is like the denier moreover much deviant just like if the one who slanders Allah is like the one who denies, the one who slanders (lies in his name) RasulAllah is just like the one who denies him. From this it is understood that surely denying him is a type of lie. Now denying what he has brought would mean informing it as not true. This is nullifying the deen of Allah. According to this, there is no difference between denying one of what he has brought and denying all of what he has brought. Surely because what this individual does, means denial of the deen of Allah for this reason he will become kafir. Essentially the one who slanders, is intentionally fabricating things which are not in deen. Nevertheless it is claiming that the ummah needs to attest to this and embrace this. The reason is because it is stating this is the deen of Allah although it is not. Fabricating things in deen and increasing it is just like decreasing deen. Likewise there is no difference between the one who denies an ayah from the Qur'an and the one who fabricates an ayah and claims it is from the Qur'an...In summary surely the Rasul (saw) is the most perfect among the creatures. In this sense whatever he had abandoned in word and in action is much better than he acting upon it. Like this, doing what he had done, is much appropriate than abandoning it. In this sense when an individual intentionally slanders (lies in his behalf) or when he informs something which is not true of him, this is essentially deficiency. If it had been maturity (necessity) it would already be present in him. Surely the one who claims deficiency to the Rasul (saw) will have become kafir. **2) Words (Statements) and Actions are the Foundation of Executing the Ahkam (hukm)**

The second view: 'The one who slanders him (saw) makes his end pessimistic. However this will not make him kafir and killing him is not permissible. The reason is because the conditions of kufr and killing are set. This is not among them. For this reason it is not permissible that something that has no bases to

be stable. Whoever says this must limit his statement in the following manner: The slander to him (saw) must not include disgrace (shame) in its dhahir. According to this if someone is to say he heard from him (saw) a statement such as this (disgraceful); when it comes to such individual (who makes such slander) this statement like the sweat of the horse and like other hadith regarding baatil, it must not; clearly and in dhahir guide to his (saw) deficiency and disgrace (shame). This is because this is a mockery with clear sarcasm. Surely this individual is a kafir whose blood is permissible. Those who carry this view have brought the following solution. Surely because the Nabi (saw) knew he had been a munafiq he did not kill him due to his lie, he killed him due to his nifaq. The truth of the matter is this answer will not mean anything. The reason is because the Prophet (saw) had not made it sunnah to kill any of those munafiq who had been trusted which he (saw) had informed their nifaq of those the Qur'an had informed their nifaq. Nevertheless how could he kill the one there had been chaste information regarding his nifaq. Likewise although he had counted some among the munafiq to Hudhaifah and others, he had not killed any of them. In this frame, fundamentally the reason mentioned in the hadith in reality, is because that individual had lied regarding (in name of) RasulAllah (saw); a lie that contained an evil intention. The death had been due to this lie. For this reason it is not permissible to build the reason of death upon another motive. Likewise surely the man had undertaken this lie in order to fulfill his own pleasure. In the same way just as things as such are done by the kuffar they also manifest in the fasiq. Again his nifaq was either from this lie or the reason for this lie. If it is from this lie it is stable that in this situation slandering him (saw) is nifaq and the munafiq becomes kafir. According to this if nifaq had been prior to this lie without need of any other reason this itself is sufficient reason to kill. So in this case why is this command of killing delayed until this moment? Why does not Allah condemn him for his nifaq until he does (lie) what he did... Likewise surely the tribe informs RasulAllah (saw) of his words. Upon this he (saw) says: "The enemy of Allah! He has lied." And later he commands that if he is found alive he should be killed and at this moment he also says "I doubt you will see him alive." The reason is he knew the finale (end) of his crime must take place immediately. After the proper attributed action, the prophet (saw) had built his punishment upon, as punishment and act of atonement when he commanded death etc, it means that the mentioned action (slandorous lie) had necessitated the given punishment. Likewise when the Arab had described to him (saw) that he had sexual intercourse in Ramadan (while fasting) he (saw) had commanded him (the Arab) compensation. Similarly when Maiz, Ghamidiya and others had confessed their fornication he (saw) commanded rajm. This is a matter we do not know of any ikhtilaf among people. However they do have ikhtilaf regarding the reason that necessitated this. Is this all the attributes or does it consist of some of them (attributes); this is something that all foundations (basis) must fit in place. Only if this action is considered ineffective and thinking another reason for its finale then this would necessarily be a fasid situation. However something more close to it then this could be said: Surely this man had slandered RasulAllah (saw). It was such lie that it necessitated his disgrace (shame) and deficiency. The reason is because he had claimed that RasulAllah (saw) had given him control over their lives and properties and that he (saw) allowed him to spend the night in the house he pleased. Along this his intention was to spend the night in the house of that woman. His intention was to commit fornication with her. As it is when he has control over their lives and properties they do not have the right (possibility) to reject him. As known surely Nabi (saw) had not made any haraam, halaal. Whoever is to claim that he had made life, properties and haraam such as fornication halaal he will have accepted deficiency and disgrace (shamefulness) in RasulAllah (saw).

Indeed he will accuse the Nabi (saw) of permitting that individual to deceive and spend the night with a strange woman. In this sense he will have claimed that he (saw) gave permission to command as he wishes over a Muslim tribe. This is vilifying and blaming the prophet (saw). For this reason, the prophet had commanded to kill the person who vilifies and slanders him without requesting his repentance. Indeed this is what had been meant. In this situation the hadith shows that in both views the hadith is evidence that the individual who slanders will be killed without the request of his tawbah (repentance). One of the things that support the first view is this: Surely if the tribe had understood that this had been slander to him (saw), they would have acted more quick to rejecting him. Indeed this could be said: This command of his made them (the tribe) doubt. With the necessity of obedience to the Rasul and the contradiction of the terror of what this cursed (man) had brought they paused until they had it confirmed by the Nabi (saw). Those who support the first view had said each lie in his (saw) name, in reality also expresses slander to him (saw). This had also been mentioned previously. Indeed it had not been mentioned in the hadith that this man really intended to slander and belittle. On the contrary he only wanted to lie in his (saw) name only so that he could arrive at his pleasure. Fundamentally this is the characteristic of all those who slander him (saw). If they had not meant sarcasm with it, they only mean to arrive at their pleasure. The aims are usually either goods (wealth) or honor. Indeed if the niyyah of the one who intends evil is not to deviate, it is for leadership and to attain respect or to attain his known (open/clear) pleasure. In summary, whoever states anything that is kufr or performs the action without the intention of becoming a kafir, for this reason he will become kafir. Because no one can intend kufr other than those Allah wished.” (as Sarim’ul Maslul 146) **3- The Reasons Amal (actions) go to Waste Although Lacking Intention**

The mentioned hadith, are the most accurate explanations in the main point of this ayah: “lest your deeds become vain and ye perceive not.” (al-Hujuraat 49/2)

Whoever speaks ill of his (saw) justice and claims such thing to be from the Nabi (saw), even if he thinks it will not harm his belief in his risalah, that this will not necessitate kufr and in reality even if he does not intend this, just like the statement “because he is the son of your paternal aunt” if he speaks ill of a hukm he (saw) has given, again whoever states “this division was not meant for the pleasure of Allah” and speaks ill of his justice, like the Arab whoever says things such as “I have been treated unjust” or another such as “give to me surely you do not give from your own or your fathers property” neither of these had meant kufr however it was only indiscreet talk of some Arab. Along all these accounted, as Ibn Taymiyyah said, these are things which necessitate death and the individual becomes a munafiq and kafir whose blood is halaal.

Due to all of these statements, although not intended, the amal (actions) of these individuals had gone to waste regardless of the fact that, they had not intended to do kufr nor were they aware of their kufr. Like this, the man who went to fornicate; as understood he had done this in the presence of that tribe relying on the following: Supposedly the Prophet had dressed him in this hulla (attire) and had given him permission to pass hukm regarding their lives and properties. As known this man had intended to please his own pleasure with this act and had not intended kufr or sarcasm. In the same way in some of the narrations it had been mentioned that he had went to perform wudu for salah however he had been

bitten by a snake. Let alone in his, own sense and mind this individual had continued to be from the Muslim; an ahl qiblah, a performer of salah, whereas in essence he was kafir. He is a munafiq whose blood is halaal. His amal and efforts have gone to waste but he was not aware of this.

Ibn Taymiyyah had said regarding this ayah “lest your deeds become vain and ye perceive not.” (al-Hujuraat 49/2) the following: The guidance of this (ayah) to the matter is like this: As Allahu subhanahu restricts them to raise their voices higher than his (saw) and as they speak to each other in high pitched voices He (awj) restricts them to speak to him (saw) like that. The reason is because raising voices and loudness can be reason to invalidate and the owner will not know this. In this sense, it has been based on the mentioned restriction of loud speaking and the choice of letting him desire saving his actions from being wasted. In this meaning with this, something that makes the amal invalid and forms its reasons therefore has informed that there are situations which make the amal invalid. Consequently this must vehemently be avoided. In this context amal will be invalidated with kufr. “And if any of you Turn back from their faith and die in unbelief, their works will bear no fruit in this life and in the Hereafter; they will be companions of the Fire and will abide therein.” (al-Baqarah 2/217) “if any one rejects faith, fruitless is his work, and in the Hereafter he will be in the ranks of those who have lost (all spiritual good).” (al-Maida 5/5) Likewise amal along with kufr will not be accepted. “Allah doth accept of the sacrifice of those who are righteous.” (al-Maida 5/27) “Those who reject Allah and hinder (men) from the Path of Allah,- their deeds will Allah render astray (from their mark).” (Muhammad 47/1) This is very clear. Only kufr will invalidate amal. The reason is because it is necessary that whoever dies upon iman enters jannah. If he had entered jahannam it will necessitate him to get out of there. No, if all of his amal has been invalidated he cannot enter jannah at all. The reason is because amal will only be invalidated with something that invalidates it. The truth to the matter is that only will kufr absolutely invalidate amal. Fundamentally this is a known incident in the usul of the ahl sunnah. Yes some amal will be invalidated with the existence of other things which invalidate it. Just as it is mentioned in this ayah: “O ye who believe! cancel not your charity by reminders of your generosity or by injury,” (al-Baqarah 2/264) Nevertheless Allah had only invalidated amal with kufr in His book. Now if it is feared that to elevate the voice louder than the Nabi (saw) and speaking loudly beside him, even without the knowledge of the individual, will make him kafir and his amal will be invalidated with this and if it is for certain that this is what it relies on and its reason, at the same time it is evident that this comprises retribution, respect, honoring, exalting, offering and pride. Likewise it is clear that even if the doer does not intend it elevating the voice it comprises torment, and belittling. Now, since without the intention of the owner (doer) with bad adab (manner) the torment and belittling that occurs is kufr, intentionally and knowingly tormenting and belittling is straightforwardly kufr.” (as- Sarim ul Maslul, 47) **4- Speaking Regarding Allah without Knowledge is the Base of bid'ah and Shirk**

The ayah and hadith mentioned previously had been regarding the ahl qiblah; those who had made Islam their deen and accepted it as their direction. These clearly establish with concept and content that the ‘abd (slave) sometimes utter some words or perform some acts that for these (words or actions) his good deeds will be wasted. And with these (words or actions) he becomes a kafir whose blood is permissible. And he will not know nor will he realize that he became a kafir by uttering a word or performing an act that he is not aware of its reality. Therefore the slave should not speak anything that

he does not know the meaning and explanation of which will lead to the pleasure or the wrath of Allah. For this reason Allah (awj) prohibited us to speak of things that we do not have knowledge regarding Him (awj).

Ibn Qayyim (ra) said: "When it comes to speaking regarding Allah without knowledge... there is no greater sin in the sight of Allah than speaking regarding Him without knowledge. The essence of shirk and kufr is this sin. The bid'ah and deviations are built upon it. Therefore the essence of every bid'ah and dalalah (misguidance) in deen is speaking regarding Allah without knowledge... The essence of shirk and kufr is speaking regarding Allah without knowledge. It is because the mushrik suppose that; the object he accounts a deity for himself will take him close to Allah, it will be an intercessor in the sight of Allah for him and as the mediators in the sight of kings, that he can get rid of his needs. Therefore every mushrik speaks regarding Allah without knowledge. However everyone who speaks regarding Him (awj) without knowledge is not mushrik. The reason is; speaking regarding Allah without knowledge sometimes involves the ta'til of the sifaat and inserting the bid'ah into the deen of Allah. So speaking regarding Allah without knowledge is a more general word than shirk. Shirk is only one of the meanings it includes... All the sins of bid'ah-doers are apart of the type of sin 'speaking regarding Allah without knowledge'. Until they make tawbah from their bid'ah, they will not be accounted to have made tawbah from their sins. Indeed how can a person who does not even know that his act is bid'ah or who supposes it is sunnah, who calls people to it and encourages people to perform it, make tawbah from it? Until these types of people, turn to sunnah and are aware of it, search for it and protect it, will not even realize the sins which making tawbah is wajib upon. It is not possible to see any bid'ah-doer who has achieved it." (Madariju's-Saliheen I, 378)

This is why we come across words from the ulama similar to the following: Whoever speaks kufr or performs kufr will be made takfir of even if this is not his intention. For this reason the slave of Allah should not utter a word without knowing its meaning or interpretation, because it may take him to the pleasure or the displeasure of Allah.

Abu Hurayrah heard RasulAllah say: "A slave of Allah may utter a word without thinking whether it is right or wrong. He may slip down in the fire as far away a distance equal to that between the east and west." (Bukhari) Abu Hurayrah narrated RasulAllah said: "A slave (of Allah) may utter a word which pleases Allah without giving it much importance and because of that Allah will raise him to degrees (of reward); a slave (of Allah) may utter a word (carelessly) which displeases Allah without thinking of its gravity and because of that he will be thrown to the hell fire." (Bukhari and Muslim)

Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "Hafidh states: 'An individual who hears something which can not be understood, in other words, the meaning for him is not cared for, and is not requested. The meaning is not set in his mind or is not even thought to be set, however it will be used when he sees the need to.' Shayh Izzeddeen b. Abdussalam states: 'This is something the one who makes the statement can not differentiate the good or evil of it. For this reason it is haraam for a human to speak of that which he can not distinguish the beautiful from the ugly.' Nawawi states 'In this hadith there is encouragement to protect the tongue. According to this the one who wishes to speak must think of what he is going to say

before speaking. If he sees benefit in himself he will speak or else he'll keep quite." It is understood in these statements that before making a statement the individual must examine the meaning and concept as he must stay away from that which he cannot distinguish beautiful from ugly. And this is a must." (As Sarim'ul Maslul, 154)

"Without giving it much importance" meaning he does not think about it and does not evaluate its result. He does not suppose that it will affect anything. It is similar to this ayah: "And ye thought it to be a light matter, while it was most serious in the sight of Allah." (an-Noor 24/15)

This is narrated with the following wording in the hadith of Bilal b al-Harith al-Muzani which is recorded by Malik and the owners of the sunnan; and accepted as sahih by Tirmidhi, Ibn Hibban and Hakim: "Without doubt any of you who utters a word which pleases Allah but does not suppose that it leads where it leads. Allah with this cause writes His pleasure for him until qiyamah." It is mentioned the same regarding His wrath...

Tirmidhi recorded this hadith with the chain of Muhammad b Ishaq: "He does not see any harm in it but he will be thrown to a distance of 70 years in the jahannam for it." (Fathu'l-Bari, Kitabu'r-Rikak, XI, 314-318)

It is understood from the mentioned hadith that the individual should investigate the meaning and the concept of the word he utters likewise he should avoid the words that he can not differentiate the goodness and the evil. And this is a must.

There is a big topic and lesson for us, in the person who is mentioned in the hadith. This person while struggling to worship Allah utters a word and destructs both his dunya and akhirah.

"Abu Dawud recorded it with his own sanad: Abu Hurayrah (ra) said: "I heard RasulAllah (saw) say: 'There were two men among Banu Isra'il, who were striving for the same goal. One of them would commit sin and the other would strive to do his best in the world. The man who exerted himself in worship continued to see the other in sin. He would say: Refrain from it. One day he found him in sin and said to him: Refrain from it. He said: Leave me alone with my Lord. Have you been sent as a watchman over me? He said: I swear by Allah, Allah will not forgive you, nor will he admit you to Paradise. Then their souls were taken back (by Allah), and they met together with the Lord of the worlds. He (Allah) said to this man who had striven hard in worship; Had you knowledge about Me or had you power over that which I had in My hand? He said to the man who sinned: Go and enter Paradise by My mercy. He said about the other: Take him to Hell. Abu Hurayrah said: By Him in Whose hand my soul is, he spoke a word by which this world and the next world of his were destroyed."

Similar of this also narrated in the Muslim: Jundub (ra) reported that RasulAllah (saw) stated that a person said: "Allah would not forgive such and such (person). Thereupon Allah (awj), said: Who is he who adjures about Me that I would not grant pardon to so and so; I have granted pardon to so and so and blotted out his deeds (who took an oath that I would not grant pardon to him)."

The author of al-Ahadithu'l-Qudsiyya said: Abu Hurayrah (ra) said: "By Him in Whose hand my soul is, he spoke a word by which this world and the next world of his were destroyed." The explainer (sharih) said: 'It destructed his dunya. Therefore his good deeds which he was struggling to perform are all wasted due to his kufr. In the same manner it is stated in the ayah: "if any one rejects faith, fruitless is his work, and in the Hereafter he will be in the ranks of those who have lost (all spiritual good)." (al-Maida 5/5) It destructed his akhirah too. So no reward and prize left for his amal. For this reason he is deserved to be said: 'take him to the jahannam!' As Nawawi stated, the intention could be this: 'take him into jahannam for eternity. It is because the kufr has occurred –even if it was only from his heart-from him. Likewise this might be mentioned: 'take him into jahannam! So he will be punished with the punishment of the sinner mu'min to be freed from the sins they perpetrating as a crime. It is because he performed a major sin. This (major sin) is his definite hukm: 'Allah will never forgive your sinner brother and he (sinner) will not enter into jannah!' (Kitabu'l-Ahadith'il-Qudsiyya, I, 51-52)

This slave who struggles for ibadaah, likes maruf and curse the munkar, he condemns his brother due to his enmity against the munkar. For this cause, with the relation with his brother instead of observing the huquq of Allah, he stated a word out of gafalah (unwariness); he did not realize how much he deserved the wrath of Allah for uttering this word. Therefore he destructed both his dunya and akhirah. Will there be a better example then this story. Likewise will there be anything that a better lesson can be learnt?

I ask Allah Who is the Rabb of the Arsh to keep myself and entire Muslim ummah away from the harmful words and take our souls with having a good result (deeds). Ameen.

b- The Special Features of the Khawaarij and its Hukm

Second Evidence: The second evidence is from the sunnah is the ahadith regarding the Khawaarij.

Ibn Kathir said: "I say this group of people is from the strangest type of children of Adam (as). So how free from all imperfection is the One who varied His creation as He willed and initiated with His magnificent degree. And what is better than what some of the salaf used to say concerning the Khawaarij, that they are mentioned in the statement of Allah (awj): "Say: 'Shall we tell you of those who lose most in respect of their deeds? Those whose efforts have been wasted in this life, while they thought that they were acquiring good by their works?' They are those who deny the Signs of their Lord and the fact of their having to meet Him (in the Hereafter): vain will be their works, nor shall We, on the Day of Judgment, give them any weight." (al-Kahf 18/103-105) So the intended meaning is that these misguided ignoramus and these criminals in terms of statements and actions have united their view that of the Khawaarij whilst they are in the midst of Muslims. And they agreed to travel to the cities in order to overtake the people and fortify the cities and then to send out delegations to their brothers and followers from amongst those who are upon their opinion and madhhab. These are from the people of Basra and other than them, so they agreed upon this and their unity was based on upon this. So Zayd ibn Husayn at-Tai said about them: 'Indeed the cities can not be overtaken, since they have armies that you can not overpower and they will prevent you from them. However arrange to meet your brothers at

the bridge of Jawfaa. And do not come from Kufah in groups but come out of it one by one so that you do not rouse suspicious.’ So they wrote a general letter to whomsoever was upon their madhhab and methodology from the people of Basrah and other than them. So in the letter, they mentioned to them to meet at the river so that they may be one hand against the people. Then they come out, pulling out one by one so that no one would know about them. So he prevented them from khuruj. So they came out in the midst of fathers, mothers, maternal uncles and maternal aunts and they separated the ties of kinship. They believed, due to their ignorance lack of knowledge and intellect that the Lord of the heavens and the earth would be pleased with this affair. So they did not know that this was from the greatest of major sins, disasters and offenses. This was from that which was made to look beautiful to them by Iblis an accursed devil who was banished from the heavens, who raised enmity for our father Adam (as) then to his children for as long as their souls inhabit their bodies. And Allah is the One Who is asked to protect us from him, by His might and power. Indeed He answers the invocations.” (al-Bidaya wa’n-nihaya 7/228)

The ideology of Khawaarij was the first innovation to appear in Islam. The Khawaarij (singular Khariji - seceder) (Fathu’l-Bari, 12/296) are group of innovators. The word “Khawaarij” is from the Arabic root verb: “kharaja” meaning to go out or leave something. This label of theirs may be translated as separatists, insurgents, rebels, nonconformist, etc. They are called as ‘Khawaarij’ that because of their leaving the (fundamentals of the) religion and for their opposing the best Muslims (the Companions of the Prophet saw). (Ibn Hajar, Fathu’l-Bari, 12/296-316; Nawawi, Sharh Sahih Muslim, 7/170; Shahrastani, al-Milal wan’nihal, 107) And it is also said that they were called Khawaarij due to their khuruj (leaving) the path of the jamaa'ah. They are the first people to go against Imam Ali in the war of Siffin, they distanced themselves from Uthman and Ali. They called people with major sins kuffar and they said that it is legitimate and compulsory to rebel against an Imam if he differs or opposes a sunnah (according to their opinion). (Al-Milal wan-Nahal, 87-99)

And the first opposition and insurgency from them occurred against the leader of the believers, Ali Ibn Abi Talib (ra) when the issue of who has the right to pass rulings was debated. The Khawaarij gathered at a place called Harura near Kufah in Iraq. The people of the land of Iraq have a history of fitnah and groups that cause strife. They are so infamous for it that; it is related from Amr ibn al-As (ra) that he said of them, “People of division and hypocrisy.”

RasulAllah (saw) said following in a hadith which is narrated from Abdullah Ibn Umar (ra): “O Allah, put barakah (blessing) on our Sham! O Allah put barakah on our Yemen. The people said, And on our Najd as well? I think the third time he (saw) said, There (Najd) is a place of earthquakes and afflictions and from it the horn of Shaitan will come out.” (Bukhari) Ibn Hajar quotes a sahabi by the name of al-Khatibi about this hadith, who had this to say, “The Najd is in the direction of the east and is in the city of the highlands of the Iraqi steppe/desert. Its direction is east of the people of Madinah, and the root of the word ‘najd’ means what is risen up (raised/elevated) from the earth in contravention to al-Gawr for that is what is lower than it..” Ad-Dawudi has also said, “Najd is with regard to the land of Iraq (min Naahiya al-Iraq).” (Fathu’l-Bari, 13/ 51).

There are some other ahadith narrated regarding the matter such as: It is narrated from Ibn Umar (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) said: "O Allah bestow your blessings on our Madinah, and bestow your blessings on our Mecca, and bestow your blessings on our Sham, and bestow your blessings on our Yemen, and bestow your blessings in our measuring (fee saa'inaa wa muddinaa). A person said, O RasulAllah and in our Iraq (as well?) and so he (saw) turned away from him and said, there will occur earthquakes, trials and tribulations and there will appear the horn of Satan." (Abu Nu'aym, al-Hilya, 6/133) This hadith of Ibn Umar (ra) also narrated by Tabarani that RasulAllah (saw) prayed Fajr and then faced the people and said, "O Allah bestow your blessings on our Madinah, O Allah bestow your blessings in our measuring, O Allah bestow your blessings in our Sham and our Yemen. A person said, And Iraq O RasulAllah? He (saw) said, from there arises the horn of Satan and the trials and tribulations would come like mounting waves." (al-Awsat) There is another hadith which is similar is related by Tabarani from Ibn Abbas (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) supplicated and said, "O Allah bestow your blessings on our Sham and Yemen. A person from amongst the people said, O RasulAllah and Iraq? He (saw) said, indeed there is the Horn of Satan, and the trials and tribulations will come like mounting waves, and indeed harshness/coarseness is in the east." (al-Kabeer) Abu Sa'ed al-Khudri said that RasulAllah (saw) made a mention of a sect that would be among his ummah which would emerge out of the dissension of the people. Their distinctive mark would be shaven heads. They would be the worst creatures or the worst of the creatures. The group who would be nearer to the truth out of the two would kill them. RasulAllah (saw) gave an example (to give their description) or he said: A man throws an arrow at the prey (or he said at the target), and sees at its iron head, but finds no sign (of blood there), or he sees at the lowest end, but would not see or find any sign (of blood there). He would then see into the grip but would not find (anything) sticking to it. Abu Sae'd then said: People of Iraq! It is you who have killed them." (Muslim) It is narrated from Yusair bin Amr: "I asked Sahl bin Hunaif, 'Did you hear the Prophet saying anything about Al-Khawaarij?' He said, I heard him saying while pointing his hand towards Iraq. 'There will appear in it (i.e, Iraq) some people who will recite the Qur'an but it will not go beyond their throats, and they will go out from (leave) Islam as an arrow darts through the game's body'." (Bukhari)

It can be deduced from the above Hadith that Najd is neither blessed nor a good place but a place of Fitna and Evil. Najd has been deprived of the prayers of RasulAllah (saw) and therefore Najd has the seal of misery and misfortune and hoping for any good from there is going against the Will of Allah. According to the ahadith; it is a place that so many fitnah had occurred and will be occurred.

It is narrated from Abu Said Khudri (ra) that he said: "Once we were in the presence and company of RasulAllah (saw). He was distributing booties (Spoils of War) when a person named Thul-Khuwaysara, who was from the tribe of Bani Tamim addressed RasulAllah (saw) 'Oh Muhammad Be Just!'. RasulAllah (saw) replied: 'A Great pity that you have doubts, if I am unjust then who will be just, you are a loser and a failure.' Thul-Khuwaysara's attitude infuriated Umar (ra) and he pleaded with RasulAllah (saw) to permit him to slay Thul-Khuwaysara. RasulAllah (saw) remarked: 'Leave him, as his slaying will serve no good purpose, as he is not the only individual but there are a host of others like him and if you compare their prayers and fasting to that of yours, you yourself will feel ashamed. These are the people who will recite the Qur'an but it will not go beyond their throats, with all these apparent virtues they will leave the fold of Deen just like the arrow leaves the bow'." (Bukhari)

It is said that these people of Khawaarij are the offsprings of Thul Khuwaisarah at-Tamimee and he was among the tribe of Tamimee. During the era of Abu Bakr (ra) the people of tribe of Tamimee were behind the false prophets such as Sajah and Musailamah.

The Khawaarij collectively agreed that both the 3rd and 4th caliphs of Islam; Uthman (ra) and later Ali (ra) were in fact disbelievers as were the other companions... And they think revolting against the leaders and governments is permissible. They also believe that any major sin is an act of disbelief... Many authentic ahadith from RasulAllah (saw) condemning them have come in ten different forms of narration like what Al-Khalaal narrated from Imam Ahmad that he said, "The Khawaarij are wicked people, and I don't know of any people on earth more evil than they." And he said, "RasulAllah's (saw) ahadith about them are authentic in ten different forms." (Al-Khalaal, as-Sunnah, I, 145, # 110) Ibn Taymiyyah (Majmu al-Fatawa, 3/279), mentioned that Muslim recorded some of them in his authentic collection as did Bukhari (Muslim; Bukhari; Fathu'l-Bari).

Shahrastani said: "Everyone who revolts against the true leader whom the Muslims have agreed upon, then he is to be called a khariji; regardless whether the khuruj occurred in the days of the companions as khuruj against the rightly guided caliphs or as revolt against those who followed them in goodness and the leaders in every age." (al-Milal wan'nihal, 105)

The Khawaarij are known by other (Arabic) names such as "Al-Haruriyyah," "Ash-Shurah," "Al-Maariqah," and "Al-Muhakkimah". (Imam Al-Ash'ari, Maqaalaat Al-Islamiyyeen, I, 206-207) They don't mind these labels except for "Al-Maariqah" which is the name taken from the Hadith when RasulAllah (saw) described them as those who "maraqa (go through or pass in and out)" of the religion. Qadi Iyad said: "They were named Maariqah (renegades) due to the statement of RasulAllah (saw) 'They shoot through the religion' (Suyuti, Sharhus sunnah of Nisai, 7/85) and they were pleased with all of the names and titles, except al-Maariqah." (Mawqif Ahlu sunnah wa jamaa'ah, 1/137-139) And they have been called al-Haruriyyah because they gathered and revolted at a place called Harura. And it is a town close to Kufah. (Nawawi, Sharh Sahih Muslim, 7/170) And they are called people of Nahrawan, because Ali (ra) fought them there. And they are called al-Muhakkimah due to their objection to tahkim (arbitrary/judgment), and their statement 'There is no judgment except for Allah.' (al-Ashari, Maqalatu'l-Islamiyya, 207)

Sects of Khawaarij are also classified as sitters and revolutionaries. Khawarijuth-Thawriyyah is the sect who revolt and fight against. Khawariju'l-Qa'diyyah (sitters) is a sect of Khawaarij who are a revolutionary movement; prefer sitting and provoking common-folks against the ruler without actually revolting.

The definition of the Qa'diyyah in the Arabic language comes from al-qu'ood (to sit) with a damma, and al-maq'ad with a fathah is something that is sat upon. Al-Qa'dah is the plural of Qaa'id, who is an instigator. (az-Zubaydi, Taju'l-Urus, 5/194; al-Azhari, Mu'jam Tadheebul-Lughah, 3/3003; al-Khaleel, al-Ayn, 3/1501)

Az-Zubaydi said: "The Qa'dah are a people from amongst the Khawaarij who sat back from helping Ali ibn Abi Talib (ra) and they sat back from fighting with him. And whoever holds their opinion is a Qa'di instigator. They hold the judgment to be a right, but they sit back when it comes to revolt against the people... And the Qa'diyyah are those who do not leave for the fighting. So it is the name of the group and the Haruriyyah (a sect among Khawaarij) are named Qa'diyyah. And the Shurat (a sect among Khawaarij) are those who try to gain the rule but do not go into battle; they are also named Qa'diyyah." (az-Zubaydi, Taju'l-Urus, 5/195) Al-Azhari said: "al-Qa'd: plural of Qaa'id and the Qadee is from amongst those Khawaarij who hold judgment to be a right, but they sit back from the revolt against the people." (al-Azhari, Mu'jam Tadheebul-Lughah, 3/3006) al-Azhari quoted that ibn Arabi said: al-Qa'd: The Shurat who desire to attain ruler-ship, yet do not wage war." (al-Azhari, Mu'jam Tadheebul-Lughah, 3/3006)

"The Qa'diyyah are those who incite the people, stir up hatred within the hearts against the rulers and issue fatawa making lawful what Allah has declared unlawful in the name of changing the evil. And they are the wickedest of the Khawaarij." (Sharr Qatlaa, 20) Abdullah ibn Muhammad ad-Daif (ra) said: "The Qa'diyyah are the wickedest of the Khawaarij." (Abu Dawud, Masailu Imam Ahmad, 271)

Ibn Hajar said: "The Khawaarij of al-Qa'diyyah did not hold the view of waging war. Rather, they opposed the rulers in accordance to their strength, they called to their opinion and along with that, they beautified revolt and held it to be good." (at-Tadheed 8/114) He also said: "The Qa'diyyah: Those who beautify revolt against the rulers yet do not actually do it themselves." (Hadyu's-Saree, 459)

"And the Qa'diyyah are, in most cases, more dangerous than the Khawaarij themselves. Since, speech, inciting hatred within the hearts and provoking the common-folks against the rulers has the most profound effect upon the souls; especially when it comes from a man who is an eloquent speaker who dupes the people with his tongue and disguises it with the Sunnah." (al-Ajwibatu'l-Mufidah, 202)

Umran ibn Hittan was the ancient leader of the Qa'diyyah. Although he believed in the statement of the Khawaarij he did not fight and remained sitting. Ibn Hajar said: "Umran ibn Hittan was accused of holding the opinion of Qa'diyyah from amongst the Khawaarij." (Hadyu's-Saree, 460)

Qataree ibn Fuja'ah who is one of the heads of the Khawaarij, revolt and fight, also among the poets of the Khawaarij; said about the Qa'diyyah such as Abu Khaled al-Qanaii:

"Flee —O Abu Khalid, since you are not khalid (immortal)

And ar-Rahman has not made an excuse for the Qaa'id (sitter)

Do you claim that Khariji is upon guidance?

Whilst you have remained back along with the thief and the deserter," (Shi'rul-Khawaarij, 128)

Ash-Shabi said: "Indeed, this outbreak of the Qa'diyyah and the Azariqah (a sect amongst the Khawaarij) is the fundamental basis for the division between the Khawaarij another time. So the Qa'diyyah in Basra are amongst the members of the Khawaarij. Abdullah ibn Amaad, Abdullah ibn Safaar and Abu Buhays

were a solitary sect (Khariji) after the judgement of the Nafi, against them. Likewise the Najdah (a Khariji) launched a scathing attack against the statement of Nafi and withdrew with an encampment. And since then, discord became the way of Khawaarij. The Khawaarij succumbed to unlawful fighting and beliefs.” (al-Mabaahith, 147)

Ali (ra) fought fiercely with them at a place called Nahrawan but only after advising and debating with them and clearly establishing the evidences against them. In that battle, less than ten of the Khawaarij remained and less than ten Muslims were killed. After the Khawaarij’s defeat, two of them fled to Oman, two to Karmaan (near Khorasan in Iran and Sijistaan), two to Sijistaan (Seistan), two to the Arabian Peninsula, and one fled to Yemen. (Shahrastani, Al-Milal wan-Nihal, 1/115-117; Baghdadi, Al-Farq bayna’l-Firaq, 75) Shahrastani said, “The innovated beliefs and methods of the Khawaarij appeared in these places from them (the nine people who were defeated and fled) and they’ve remained ever since up until today.” (Al-Milal wan-Nihal, 1/117)

Jabir ibn Abdullah (ra) was weeping and he said, “I heard RasulAllah (saw) saying, ‘Truly, people will enter the religion of Allah in great crowds and they will leave from it in great crowds’. ” (Ahmad)

1- Khawaarij and sincerity in the Deen of Allah

It is a must for the Muslim to combine two characteristics while worshipping Allah without which a deed is not accepted by Allah: The action of the slave must be done sincerely and solely for the sake of Allah and not due to riyaa (showing off) nor for seeking reputation. And also he must be following correctly what RasulAllah (saw) was upon.

It is narrated that RasulAllah (saw) said: “There will appear from this man’s progeny people who one of you would belittle his own prayer when compared with theirs, and his fasting compared to theirs. (But) they will pass through the religion just as an arrow might pass through a target.” (Bukhari; Muslim)

RasulAllah (saw) also said: “Indeed there will be a people amongst you who will feign in worshipping Allah until the people become amazed with them and they become amazed with themselves. They will shoot through the religion just as the arrow shoots through the game.” (Abu Ya’la, musnad with sahih sanad.)

When we look at these ahadith and others that have similar concept it seems RasulAllah (saw) attributed them as being sincere. But we know that if they had anything of sincerity, they’d follow the guidance of RasulAllah (saw), and submit with those who are gathered with goodness. Therefore their ibadaah will not benefit them, even if they increase in their worship.

Ibn Qayyim said: “Allah has made devotion of worship to Him alone and following the Sunnah the means of deeds being accepted; if these conditions are not met, then deeds are unacceptable.” (al-Rooh, 1/135)

“So whoever hopes for the Meeting with his Lord, let him work righteousness and associate none as a

partner in the worship of his Lord” [al-Kahf 18:110]

Ibn Kathir (may Allah have mercy on him) said: “ ‘So whoever hopes for the Meeting with his Lord’ means His reward; ‘let him work righteousness’ means actions that are done for the sake of Allah alone, with no partner or associate. These two factors form the basis for an acceptable deed: it must be done sincerely for the sake of Allah alone, and it must be correct and in accordance with the sharee’ah of RasulAllah (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him).”

“Whoever does any action that is not in accordance with this matter of ours (i.e., Islam), will have it rejected.” (Narrated by Muslim, al-Aqdiyyah, 3243).

Ibn Rajab (ra) said: “This hadith forms one of the most important principles of Islam. It is like a scale for weighing up deeds according to their outward appearance, just as the hadith ‘The reward of deeds depends upon the intentions’ is the means of weighing up the inner nature of deeds. Just as every action which is not intended for the sake of Allah brings no reward to the one who does it, so too every deed which is not in accordance with the command of Allah and His Messenger will also be rejected and thrown back at the one who does it. Everyone who innovates in Islam something for which Allah and His Messenger have not granted permission, that thing is nothing to do with Islam. (Jaami’ al-‘Uloom wa’l-Hukam, part 1, p. 176)

Fudayl ibn Iyad said: “The action must be a) sincere (i.e. done sincerely for Allah) and b) correct (i.e. conformity in the Sunnah), so if the action is correct but if it is not done with sincerity then it will not be accepted. Likewise if the action is sincere but it is not done correctly then it will not be accepted. So the action must be sincere and correct.” (Ibn Taymiyyah, Fatawa 1/333; Abu Nuaym Hilyatu’l-Awliya, 8/95)

It was narrated by Muslim from Abu Hurayrah that RasulAllah (saw) said: “Allah, may He be blessed and exalted, says: ‘I am so self-sufficient that I am in no need of having an associate. Thus he who does an action for someone else’s sake as well as Mine will have that action renounced by Me to him whom he associated with Me.’” (Narrated by Muslim, al-Zuhd wa’l-Raqaa’iq, 5300)

We can come to a conclusion out of these narrations and say that Muslim must at the same time combine both sincerity and correct actions in accordance to the sunnah while worshipping, these are conditions for an deed to be acceptable to Allah (swt). If he associates anything to Allah then his deeds will not be accepted. In the same manner, if he acts with sincerity and without riyaa or without seeking any type of reputation, however if he is misguided and does not perform according to the Sunnah, his deeds will not be accepted. The deeds of Khawaarij were described as sincere in the ahadith yet they were not practicing in the correct manner even though they increased in worship and strove hard in it. So they shot through the religion due to extremism, ignorance and takfir of the Muslimeen.

According to a narration, once three people came to the blessed wives of RasulAllah (saw) to ask regarding his worship. When they were informed they found it to be less than expected and said ‘how can we compare to RasulAllah (saw), his past and future sins are forgiven.’ Then one of them said, ‘I will pray all night forever.’ The other one said, ‘I will fast forever.’ The third said, ‘I will stay away from women and never get married.’ When RasulAllah (saw) heard this, he (saw) said, ‘By Allah I am more

fearful of Allah, yet I fast and don't fast, I pray and sleep and marry women, Nikah is from my Sunnah, whoever turns away (is not satisfied) from my Sunnah is not from me'." (Bukhari)

There is this hadith which is narrated from Abdullah Ibn Mas'ud (ra) and it is regarding the roots of the Khawaarij and their misguidance and extreme in acts of worship: "Amr ibn Salmah said: We used to sit in front of Abdullah Ibn Mas'ud's house before the fajr prayer, so that when he came out we would go with him to the Masjid. (One day) Abu Musa al-Ashari (ra) came and asked us: 'Did Abu Abdur Rahman (i.e. Ibn Mas'ud) leave yet?' We answered: 'No.' So Abu Musa al-Ashari (ra) sat with us waiting for him. When he came out, we all stood up. Abu Musa told him: 'Oh, Abu Abdurrahman! I recently saw something in the Masjid which I deemed to be evil, but all praise is for Allah, I did see anything except good'. Ibn Mas'ud (ra) then asked: 'Then what was it?' Abu Musa said: 'You will see it if you stay alive. In the Masjid, I saw a group of people sitting in circles waiting for the salah (prayer). Each circle is led by a person. And every person in these circles carries small stones (pebbles). The leader of a circle would say: 'Say 'Allahu Akbar' a hundred times' so they would repeat Allahu Akbar a hundred times; then he says 'Say 'La-ilaha illallah', a hundred times' so they would say 'La-ilaha illallah' a hundred times; then he would say: 'Say 'SubhanAllah', a hundred times', they will say 'SubhanAllah' a hundred times. Then Ibn Mas'ud said: 'What did you tell them?' He said: 'I didn't say anything; I waited to hear your opinion.' Abdullah Ibn Mas'ud (ra) said: 'Could you not order them to count their evil deeds, and assured them of getting their rewards.' Then Abdullah Ibn Mas'ud went ahead and we accompanied him. As he approached one of the circles, he said: 'What is this that you are doing?' They said: 'Oh! Abu Abdurrahman, these are pebbles to count the number of times we say Allahu Akbar, La-ilaha illallah, and SubhanAllah.' He said: 'Count your evil deeds and I assure you that you are not going to lose anything of your rewards (Hasanat). Woe unto you, people of Muhammad, how quickly you go to destruction! Those are your Prophet's companions available, these are his clothes not worn out yet, and his pots are not broken yet. I swear by Whom my soul is in His Hands that you are either following a religion that is better than the Prophet's religion or you are opening a door of misguidance.' They said: 'We swear by Allah (jj) oh, Abu Abdurrahmaan, that we had no intention other than doing good deeds.' He said: 'So what? How many people wanted to do good deeds but never got to do them? RasulAllah (saw) has told us about people who recited the Qur'an with no effect on them other than the Qur'an passing through their throats. I swear by Allah, I am almost sure that most of you are from that type of people.' Then he left them. Umar Ibn Salamah (the sub narrator) said: 'We saw most of the people of those circles fighting against us with the Khawaarij in the battle of An-Nahrawan'." (Darimi; Abu Nu'aym, with an authentic chain of narrations.)

Imam Ajurri said: "It is not permissible for the one who sees the uprising of a khariji who has revolted against the leader, whether he is just or oppressive, so this person has revolted and gathered a group behind him, has pulled out his sword and has made lawful the killing of Muslims, it is not fitting for the one who sees, he becomes deceived by this persons recitation of the Qur'an, the length of his standing in the prayer, nor his constant fasting, nor his good and excellent words in knowledge when it is clear to him that this persons way and methodology is that of the Khawaarij." (ash-sharee'ah 28)

It is because Khawaarij went to extremes in acts of worship and go beyond the limits; they fall into

extremism which is bid'ah and misguidance. They have left Sunnah of RasulAllah (saw) which is the only way for ones salvation, and turned away from it while being dissatisfied with it. They separated from the path of the jamaa'ah and haqq, therefore it is not proper to say that these ahadith are in praise of them. As RasulAllah (saw) stated: "Whoever isn't satisfied with my way then he's not from me" The reason for this hukm is, every innovation introduced in the ummah began as something small and mostly with good intentions, bearing resemblance to the haqq, which is why those who entered it were mislead and then were unable to leave it. Then it grew and became the religion which they followed and thus deviated from the straight path and eventually left Islam.

In another narration it is related that blessings from the Khawaarij has fallen: Imam Ahmad reported from Abu At-Tufail who said: "A young boy was born to a man during the lifetime of RasulAllah (saw). So he was brought to RasulAllah who took hold of the skin on his face and supplicated for him to be blessed. Afterward a hair sprouted from the boy's forehead in the shape of a bow. Later on, the boy became a young man. Then when it was the time in which the Khawaarij appeared, he loved them, and so the hair on his forehead fell off. So his father took hold of him and restricted and detained him out of fear that he would join their ranks. (The narrator states): So we entered in his presence and admonished him. And one of the things we said to him was: 'Don't you see that the blessing from the supplication of RasulAllah (saw) has fallen from your forehead?' We continued with him until he turned back from their views. And afterward, Allah returned the hair back to his forehead, and he repented." (Musnad)

Many amongst the salaf such as Uthman Ibn Abi Shaybah (ra) said: "The disobedient sinners (fussaq) of the ashbabul hadith are better than the worshippers from other than them." (Khatib al-Baghdade, Sharaf Ashabul Hadith # 98; al-Harawi, Dhammul Kalaam #96)

2- Khawaarij in the sunnah

Al-Khallal narrated from Ahmad b Hanbal: "RasulAllah's (saw) ahadith about them are authentic in ten different forms." (as-Sunnah, I, 145, # 110)

Ibn Taymiyyah records that Imam Ahmad stated: "'RasulAllah's (saw) ahadith about them are authentic in ten different forms. Muslim has reported all ten of these in his Sahih by consent to Imam Ahmad. As Bukhari narrated some of these he also narrated the sunnan and musnad sahih in different ways." (Fatawa, 7/479)

It is narrated from Abu Salama and Abdullah bin Amr bin Yasar that they visited Abu Sa'ed al-Khudri and asked him about Al-Haruriyyah (Khawaarij) "Did you hear RasulAllah saying anything about them? Abu Sa'ed said, I do not know what Al-Haruriyyah is, but I heard RasulAllah saying, There will appear in this nation -he did not say 'from this nation'- a group of people so pious apparently that you will consider your prayers inferior to their prayers, but they will recite the Qur'an, the teachings of which will not go beyond their throats and will go out of their religion as an arrow darts through the game, whereupon the archer may look at his arrow, its Nasl at its Risaf and its Fuqa to see whether it is blood-stained or not (i.e. they will have not even a trace of Islam in them)." (Bukhari; Muslim)

It is narrated from Abu Sa'ed al-Khudri (ra) that he said: "When we were in the company of RasulAllah (saw) and he was distributing the spoils of war, there came to him Thul-Khuwaysira, one of Banu Tamim. He said: O RasulAllah, do justice. Upon this RasulAllah (saw) said: Woe be upon thee I Who would do justice, if I do not do justice? You would be unsuccessful and incurring a loss, if I do not do justice. Upon this Umar b. Khattab (ra) said: RasulAllah, permit me to strike off his neck. RasulAllah (saw) said: Leave him, for he has friends (who would outwardly look to be so religious and pious) that everyone among you would consider his prayer insignificant as compared with their prayer, and his fast as compared with their fasts. They would recite the Qur'an but it would not go beyond their collarbones. They would pass through (the teachings of Islam so hurriedly) just as the arrow passes through the prey. He would look at its Iron head, but would not find anything sticking there. He would then see at the lowest end, but would not find anything sticking there. He would then see at its grip but would not find anything sticking to it. He would then see at its feathers and he would find nothing sticking to them (as the arrow would pass so quickly that nothing would stick to it) neither excrement nor blood. They would be recognized by the presence of a black man among them whose upper arms would be like a woman's breast, or like a piece of meat as it quivers, and they would come forth at the time when there is dissension among the people. Abu Sa'ed said: I testify to the fact that I heard it from RasulAllah (saw), and I testify to the fact that Ali b. Abi Talib fought against them and I was with him. He gave orders about that man who was sought for, and when he was brought in, and when I looked at him, he was exactly as RasulAllah (saw) had described him." (Bukhari; Muslim; al-Bidaya wa'n-Nihaya)

In another narration it reads: "(they) would swerve through the religion (as blank) just as a (swift) arrow passes through the prey." It is also narrated that: There would arise from my Ummah a people who would recite the Qur'an, and your recital would seem insignificant as compared with their recital, your prayer as compared with their prayer, and your fast, as compared with their fast. They would recite the Qur'an thinking that it supports them, whereas it is an evidence against them. Their prayer does not get beyond their collar bone; they would swerve through Islam just as the arrow passes through the prey." (Muslim)

In another narration it is said: "they would pass clean through their religion just as the arrow passes through the prey, and they would never come back to it. They would be the worst among the creation and the creatures." (Muslim)

"They will recite the Qur'an, but it will not go further than their throats."

According to Nawawi's narration, "Qadi said there are two ta'weels for this

1- The hearts will not comprehend. When they read they will not benefit from it. They do not have for their share any more than reading by mouth throat and pharynx (hulooq). It is because the mahraj of the words are done with them.

2- Neither their amal nor readings will ascend and they also won't be accepted." (Nawawi, 7/159; Muslim)

There is a chapter in Bukhari "Chapter: Killing the Khawaarij and Heretics after establishing the

proof against them” and the statement of Allah:

“And Allah will not mislead a people after He hath guided them, in order that He may make clear to them what to fear (and avoid) for Allah hath knowledge of all things.” (at-Tawba 9/115)

Ibn ‘Umar saw them as the most sharr (evil) among the creation. “They took ayaat that were revealed concerning the disbelievers and applied them to the believers.” (Bukhari)

Ali (ra) said: Whenever I narrate to you anything from RasulAllah (saw) believe it to be absolutely true as falling from the sky is dearer to me than that of attributing anything to him (saw) which he never said. When I talk to you of anything which is between me and you (there might creep some error in it) for battle is an outwitting. I heard RasulAllah (saw) as saying: There would arise at the end of the age a people who would be young in age and immature in thought, but they would talk (in such a manner) as if their words are the best among the creatures. They would recite the Qur'an, but it would not go beyond their throats, and they would pass through the religion as an arrow goes through the prey. So when you meet them, kill them, for in their killing you would get a reward with Allah on the Day of Judgment.” (Muslim; al-Bidaya wa'n-Nihaya; Fathu'l-Bari)

i- Some of Their Attributes and Characteristics

They are young in age. RasulAllah (saw) said: “young in age” (Bukhari; Muslim) ‘Young in age’ here means youth who have not matured and who have not learned enough to learn the truth. (Nawawi, Sharh Sahih Muslim, 12/283; Ibn Hajar, Fathu'l-Bari, 12/78) Ibnul Athar stated: “Young in age: an indirect expression referring to youth and those in their early years.” (an-Nihayah 1/351) RasulAllah (saw) said: “the blessing with your elders.” Al-Manawi said in Faydul-Qadeer “the blessing with your elders who have experience in the affairs and who have preserved many rewards. So sit with them so that you may follow their views and be guided by their guidance.” (3/220)

They have foolish minds – i.e. intellects. RasulAllah (saw) said: “imbecilic in understanding” (Bukhari; Muslim) And ‘imbecilic in understanding’ here means foolish, ignorant and not having enough intellect. (Nawawi, Sharh Sahih Muslim, 12/283; Ibn Hajar, Fathu'l-Bari, 12/78) Ibnul Athar said: “imbecilic in understanding (sufahaul ahlam) The meaning of ahlam is understanding and intellect and as-sufh is (being) thoughtless and reckless.” (an-Nihayah, 1/434; 2/376)

They have a weakness when it comes to understanding the Religion of Allah. This is why it has been reported that “They recite the Qur'an but it does not surpass...” (Muslim) Narrated from Abu Sa'ed al-Khudri (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) said: “...or go past their throats.” (Bukhari) In one narration which is narrated from Abu sa'ed al-Khudri (ra), it states: “...their pharynx's (hulooq).” (Muslim) In another narration, it states: Narrated from Abu Dharr (ra) “...their pharynx's (halaqaqehim).” (Muslim) In another narration from Sahl b Hanif, it states: “...their collar bones (taraqaqehim).” (Bukhari) In another narration from Abu Bakrah, it states: “They will make their tongues eloquent with the Qur'an.” (Ibn Abi Asim, As-Sunnah) In another narration from Sahl bin Hanif, it states: “They will recite the Qur'an with their tongues but it will not go past their collar bones.” (Muslim) In another narration from Ali ibn Talib

(ra): "They will hold it (i.e. the recitation) to be for them, when it is against them." (Ibn Abi Asim, As-Sunnah) In another narration from Ali Ibn Talib (ra), it states: "They will think..." instead of "They will hold..." (Muslim) In one narration from Abu Zaid Al-Ansari, RasulAllah (saw) said: "They will call to the Book of Allah, but they will have nothing to do with Allah." (Ibn Abi Asim, As-Sunnah) In another narration of the hadith, the Khawaarij and what they undergo when reciting the Qur'an was mentioned to Ibn Abbas (ra), so he said: "They are not as extreme in their striving as the Jews and the Christians were, but yet they went astray." (Shari'ah, 27-28) And in another narration, Ibn Abbas (ra) said: "They believe in His clear verses, but go astray concerning His unclear verses. No one knows their hidden meanings except Allah. And as for those firmly rooted in knowledge, they say: 'We believe in it.'" And he said: "They are in a confused and drunken state. They are neither Jews nor Christians nor Magians, so that they may be excused." (Shari'ah, 28)

RasulAllah (saw) said: "Their sign is a black man; one of his arm is like the breast of a woman, or like a piece of meat tadardar (moving loosely). (Ibn Hajar Fathul Bari, 12/308) And they will come about at a division amongst the Muslims. (Bukhari; Muslim) And there has occurred from Zayd ibn Wahb al-Juhayni that he was in the army which came along with Ali (ra) to the Khawaarij. So Ali (ra) said: O people! I heard RasulAllah (saw) saying: 'A people will come out of my ummah reciting the Qur'an. Your recitation is nothing when compared to their recitation, your prayer is nothing when compared to their prayers and your fast is nothing when compared to their fast. They will recite the Qur'an thinking that is in their favour, yet it will be against them, it will not pass beyond their throats (the bone which is between the shoulder and the neck). (Fathul Bari, 12/293) The battle between Ali and Khawaarij was fast and fierce, but in the end, as truth ultimately must prevail over the dark oppression of falsehood, the Khawaarij were defeated. As Ali was surveying the bodies of the dead, he was looking for some sign that he had killed the very Khawaarij that RasulAllah (saw) had made mention of in the hadith. Ali (ra) was looking for the man that RasulAllah (saw) had said that his hand would look like a small breast. When he was found, Ali (ra) exclaimed, "Allahu Akbar -thrice. I have been utilised to fulfill the prophecy and you all know the hadith."

Their distinguishing attribute is that they shave their heads. It is narrated from Abu Sa'ed al-Khudri (Muslim) in another narration of the hadith from Anas b Malik, it states: "At-Tasbeet." (Muslim) The word 'Tasbeet' which is mentioned in the hadith is: Removing the short hair. In a sahih hadith which is recorded by Muslim and narrated from Abi Asim that RasulAllah (saw) described them saying they would be called as at-tahalluq. Imam Nawawi in the sharh of Muslim said: "And the intended meaning of at-tahalluq is shaving the heads. And some of the people used this as a proof for dislike (makruh) of shaving the head but there is no proof for that in this. It is only one of their signs and a sign can be something unlawful or it can be something lawful." (7/167) Narrated Abu Sa'ed al-Khudri and Anas ibn Malik (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) said: "Soon there will appear disagreement and dissension in my people; there will be people who will be good in speech and bad in work. They recite the Qur'an, but it does not pass their collar-bones. They will swerve from the religion as an arrow goes through the animal shot at. They will not return to it till the arrow comes back to its notch. They are worst of the people and animals. Happy is the one who kills them and they kill him. They call to the book of Allah, but they have nothing to do with it. He who fights against them will be nearer to Allah than them (the rest of the

people). The people asked: What is their sign? He replied: They shave the head.” (Abu Dawud with sahih isnad.) In the matn of hadith both the words ‘tahliq’ and ‘tasbeet’ were used. These two words are very close in regards to their meaning. ‘Tasbeet’ is having hair cut and shaving the hair. It is also said that it means not oiling/greasing the hair or not cleaning/washing the hair.

In a hadith which is narrated from Sharik b Shihab by Nasai, it is related that Abu Barza (ra) described the man who accused RasulAllah (saw) as “matmumush sha'r” (the one who has long and thick hair) and Ibnul Athar explained the word ‘matmumush sha'r’ which is mentioned in the hadith as: "The one with a lot of hair, the one with hair that covers the head”. Here the expression “sha'r: hair” could mean the hair on the face, the beard. Meaning with the expression a man with a thick beard and shaved head could have been meant. Another hadith which is narrated from Amir bin Wasila by Tabarani also confirms the same meaning. The mentioned individual is a Khawaarij who had not shaved the hair on his head. What is understood from the narrations is that they shaved the hair on their heads in the later era. This has become a principal for all the Khawaarij. However the only thing that distinguishes the Khawaarij is not only shaving their heads. RasulAllah (saw) had shaved the hair on his head also and some among the sahabah. Some salih among the ummah had continuously shaved their heads also. For this reason the mentioned hadith here does not carry a meaning that it is restricted to shave the heads. Therefore there is a possibility that the word tasbeet mentioned in the nass regarding this matter referred to the Khawaarij who rise after the first generation of Khawaarij whose distinguishing feature is that they shave their beards. There is a possibility that there are Khawaarij who rise in some eras which shave their beards and cut their hair. In the sharee'ah there is no restriction in cutting the hair and keeping the beard long so in this sense the hadith in which they are mentioned in would point out that they are a part of a group which performs the evil of shaving their beards. In the sharee'ah it is only the shaving of the beard which is restricted. Because we have not come across an expression that it is in this meaning and because there are narrations restriction of shaving the beard we could say that this is a great possibility. Due to the fact that fear and its like is not an excuse those who carry the Islamic belief should not take the matter of shaving the beard lightly.

They (the Khawaarij) are the first ones who split away from the unified body of Muslims and declared them to be disbelievers due to (their committing of) sins. This description of Khawaarij is made by Shaikhul Islam Ibn Taymiyyah. (Majmoo-ul-Fatawa 3/349 and 7/279) They are from those in whose hearts is a deviation. It is narrated from Abu Umamah (ra) that the ones who are intended by the following verses were the Khawaarij: “But as for those in whose hearts there is a deviation, they follow what is unclear thereof...” (Ale Imran 3/7) and His saying: “On the Day when some faces will be brightened and some faces will be darkened...” (Ale Imran 3/106). (Ahmad)

They declare a Muslim to be a disbeliever due to every sin. They say: “They leave the fold of iman and enter into disbelief.” (Sharh al-Aqidah at-Tahawiyyah, 298) They hold that the Muslims who commit major sins will reside eternally in the Hellfire. This is also recorded in the Sharh al-Aqidah at-Tahawiyyah (360) they say: “Every sin that a person commits makes him a disbeliever, since he is ignorant of Allah. This is done by the Makramiyyah al-Munshaqqah from the Tha'alabiyyah; one of the sects of the Khawaarij. They are the worst of people in deriving rules based on analogy. This is also in al-Milal wan-

Nihal (1/116)

They deem the subjects disbelievers if their leader commits disbelief. This is done by the Baihasiyyah; one of the sects of the Khawaarij. (al-Milal wan-Nihal (1/126) They declare those who don't agree with their views to be disbelievers, and they consider their blood lawful for shedding. They also permit the killing of the women and children that oppose them. This is done by the Azariqah; one of the sects of the Khawaarij. (Lawaami'-ul-Anwaar al-Bahiyyah 1/86) They hold that it is obligatory to fight against the ruler alone as well as whoever is pleased with his rule. As for those who reject the ruler, then it is not permissible to fight against them unless they support the ruler, attack the beliefs of the Khawaarij or serve as guides for the ruler. This is done by the Ujaradah; one of the sects of the Khawaarij. They do not hold that an oppressive ruler has the right to leadership. This is recorded by Imam Ashari. (Maqaalat al-Islaamiyeen 1/204) they hold it as an obligatory duty to rebel against the leader if he opposes the Sunnah. This is recorded in al-Milal wan-Nihal (1/115)

They hold that iman is: Knowledge of Allah and of what RasulAllah (saw) came with. So whoever commits something that he is not sure of as to whether it is lawful or unlawful, he is a disbeliever, since he was obligated to have researched into the matter. This is done by the Baihasiyyah – one of the sects of the Khawaarij. (Lawaami'-ul Anwaar al-Bahiyyah 1/87)

They come out from the Religion just as an arrow comes out from the hunted game. Then they do not return back to it. This is narrated from Abu Dharr (ra). (Muslim) And in another narration from Abu Sa'ed al-Khudri: "They shoot out from the Religion just as an arrow shoots out from the hunted game." (Bukhari) In another report narrated from Ali (ra) it states: "They shoot out from Islam..." (Bukhari) They will shoot through (yamruqun) Islam just as an arrow shoots the hunted game. Ibn Athar stated: "That is they will enter it, tear through it and leave it, just an arrow will pierce the thing that is shot at and then come out of it." (an-Nihaya 4/320) "And when the arrow shoots in to hunted game, it comes out from the other side, opposite the side from where it entered. So the Khawaarij were called Mariqah due to the statement of RasulAllah (saw) 'They will shoot through (yamruqun) Islam just an arrow shoots through hunted game'." (az-Zari, Mukhtararus-sihhah, 1/259)

Their iman does not go past their throats. This is narrated in a hadith from Ali (ra) by Bukhari. Due to deviation and separation from the path of haqq and jamaa'ah, their iman will only be considered just a claim which would not reach to the heart. Their prayer does not go past their throats. This is narrated from Ali ibn Abi Talib (ra). (Muslim) They will speak the truth with their tongues, but it will not go past this from them. Ali bin Abi Talib (ra) said: "They will speak the truth with their tongues, but it will not go past this from them. And he pointed to his throat. They are from the most despised of Allah's creation to Him. He said this when they told him: There is no rule except for that of Allah's." (Muslim)

They will kill the people of iman and leave alone the worshippers of idols. In one narration from Abu Sa'ed al-Khudri, it states: "And they will kill the People of Islam, while leaving alone the people of Awthaan (idols)." (Muslim) Imam Ashari said: "As for the sword, then all of the Khawaarij speak of it and hold it except the Ibadiyyah. They do not hold resisting the people with sword. However they hold

removing the tyrannical leaders.” (Maqalatul Islamiyyan 1/204) Ibn Taymiyyah said: “the Khawaarij are the most apparent of the people of innovation and fighting against the rulers.” (Fatawa 7/217) They are always fighting against the Muslims. They killed Uthman (ra) and they killed Ali bin Abi Talib (ra). They killed az-Zubayr Ibn-ul-Awwam (ra) and killed the best of the Companions. They will set out (to fight) against the best group amongst people. RasulAllah (saw) described His companions as the best generation. (Bukhari)

They shed unlawful blood. This is narrated from Ali bin Abi Talib. (Muslim) They lie in wait on the roads for the purpose of attacking the passers-by and spilling their blood without any justification from Allah. It is mentioned in the speech of Aisha (raa). (Hakim, Mustadrak; Majma'-uz-Zawaa'id)

They oppose and even accuse RasulAllah (saw). Allah's saying: “And among them are some who accuse you (O Muhammad) in the matter of the (distribution of) alms...” (at- Tawbah 9/58) was revealed concerning Abdullah bin Thul-Khuwaysirah At-Tamimee, the founding father of the Khawaarij and this is narrated from Abu Sa'ed al-Khudri (ra). (Bukhari) Ibnu'l-Jawzi stated: “I am not surprised at their certainty about their knowledge nor their conviction that they were more knowledgeable than Ali (ra) for Thul Khuwasirah had told RasulAllah (saw) ‘Be just for you have been unfair.’ And it was Iblis who led them to perpetrate these infamies; we seek refuge in Allah from abandonment and defeat (at the hands of Iblis).” (Talbisu'l-Iblis) They permit oppression against RasulAllah (saw). This is related from Abu Sa'ed al-Khudri (ra). (Bukhari; Ibn Taymiyyah, Majmoo-ul- Fatawa 19/73) They disparage their rulers and claim them to be upon misguidance As Abdullah bin Thul-Khuwaysirah did with RasulAllah and others to Uthman (ra), Ali (ra) and likes.

They do not believe that the people of knowledge and virtue hold a special position. They perceived that they were more knowledgeable than Ali bin Abi Talib, Ibn Abbas and the rest of the Companions, may Allah be pleased with all of them. (al-Khawaarij Awwalul-Firaq fi Tarikh-il-Islam 38) Ibnu'l-Jawzi said: “I am not surprised at their certainty about their knowledge nor their conviction that they were more knowledgeable than Ali (ra)” (Ibnu'l-Jawzi, Talbisu'l-Iblis) They do not respect the sanctity of places or times, as occurred with the Qaraamitah and those who came after them.

Not one of the Companions of RasulAllah (saw) could be found amongst them (i.e. to support them). This is also recorded by Hakim. (Mustadrak)

Every time a new generation springs forth from them, it gets cut off (i.e. from the Jamaa'ah). This is narrated from Ibn Umar (ra). (Ibn Majah) The Khawaarij will never come to an end. Rather, they will continue to exist until the establishment of the Final Hour. This is related from Ali (ra). (Bukhari). There will emerge from amidst them the Dajjal. In a narration it states: “...from their treachery...” And in one manuscript: “...from their ranks...” And that refers to a great army and this is narrated from Ibn Umar (ra). (Ibn Majah). There will be from among them those who will be with the Dajjal during the Last Days. It was said to Ali (ra): “All praise be to Allah who rescued the servants from them.” He replied: “Nay. I swear by the One in whose Hand my soul is, there are still some of them that remain in the loins of men and verily, there are those amongst them who will be with the Dajjal. (Lawaami'-ul-Anwaar al-Bahiyyah

They speak with the best speech amongst creation. Imam Bukhari narrated this from Ali (ra). However they would not benefit from it. They beautify their speech but produce vile actions. This character of theirs is narrated by Abu Sa'ed al-Khudri (ra). (Abu Dawud). They outwardly manifest the attributes of calling to good and forbidding evil, redirecting the religious texts concerning that towards disputing with the rulers, rebelling against them and fighting against those who oppose them. These are mentioned in ash-Shari'ah (22) and also al-Khawaarij Awwalul-Firaq fee Tarikh-il-Islam (37). They speak using the speech and words of the people of knowledge. Muhammad bin al-Husayn (ra) said: "It is not befitting for one who sees the tireless efforts of a Khariji that has rebelled against a ruler, whether just or tyrannical. thus setting out against him, rallying a group against him, unsheathing swords and deeming it lawful to fight against Muslims – it is not befitting for him to be deceived by such a person's recitation of the Qur'an nor by the length of his standing in prayer, nor by his perseverance in fasting, nor by his good words concerning knowledge, so long as he holds the views of the Khawaarij." (ash-Shari'ah 28)

They go astray with regard to Allah's unclear verses. They do not try to combine between the clear and unclear verses, as those firmly-grounded in knowledge do. Ibn Abbas (ra) said: "They believe in His clear verses, but go astray concerning His unclear verses. No one knows their hidden meanings except Allah. And as for those firmly rooted in knowledge, they say: 'We believe in it.'" And he said: "They are in a confused and drunken state. They are neither Jews nor Christians nor Magians, so that they may be excused." (Shari'ah, 28) They will become so deeply absorbed (ta'ammuq meaning relying and using as proof that which the religious texts do not substantiate.) in the Religion to the point that they will leave from it. This is narrated from Abdullah b Amr. (Ibn Abi Asim, As-Sunnah) They call the people to the Book of Allah but have nothing to do with it, meaning err in their manner of deriving the basis of proof from them. Narrated from Abu Sa'ed al-Khudri and Anas b Malik (Abu Dawud) They cling onto the apparent meanings of the Qur'anic texts. Even though they don't intend to oppose it, however, they understand from it that which the texts do not indicate. They have claimed that the prophets committed major and minor sins based on Allah's statement: "Verily, We have given you a manifest victory, So that Allah may forgive you of your past and future sins." (al-Fath 48/1-2) According to them RasulAllah (saw) may commit disbelief then repent. (Al-Khawaarij –Aqidatan wa Fikran wa Filasufatan 54)

They use as evidence verses from the Qur'an that deal with the wa'id (Allah's threat of punishment) while abandoning the verses concerning the wa'ad (Allah's promise for forgiveness). (Al-Khawaarij Awwalul-Firaq fi Tarikh-il-Islam 38) They are hasty in applying rulings. (al-Khawaarij Awwalul-Firaq fi Tarikh-il-Islam 146) They make rulings and accusations against the hearts. This includes issuing rulings on one's decisions and notions. (al-Khawaarij Awwalul-Firaq fi Tarikh-il-Islam 147)

They reject the Sunnah if there is not some explicit text in the Qur'an that supports it. Shaikhu'l-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) said: "They do not take anything from the Sunnah except for that which can be interpreted in its general sense, not including those texts that contradict what is apparently stated in the Qur'an, according to them. So they do not believe in stoning the fornicator nor do they believe that

there is a minimum (stolen) amount, which constitutes stealing.” (Majmoo-ul-Fatawa 13/48) And also said: “So at times they revile the isnaad and at times the text. And if they do not understand it, then they do not follow it. They are not to be trusted with the reality of Sunnah which RasulAllah (saw) came with. Rather they are not to be trusted with the reality of the Qur’an.” (Fatawa 19/73)

They are excessive in performing acts of worship. It is narrated from Ali Ibn Abi Talib (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) said: “Your prayer is nothing as compared to their prayer. Your fasting is nothing as compared to their fasting. And your reciting the Qur’an is nothing as compared to their reciting.” (Muslim) In one narration of this Hadith which is narrated from Abu Sa’ed al-Khudri (ra), it states: “You will look down at your prayer as compared to their prayer...” (Muslim) And in another narration: “...(and you will look down) at your deeds as compared to their deeds.” (Sharh Usool i’tiqaad Ahlu’s-Sunnah 8/1231) They go to extremes in worship. So they perform acts of worship to the extent that those who see them become amazed with them and they become amazed with themselves. This is narrated from Anas b Malik (Ibn Abi Asim, as-Sunnah) Ibn Abbas (ra) said: “And I have not seen a people that are stricter in their exertion (of worship) than them. Their hands are like the calluses of camels and their foreheads are marked due to the traces of prostration.” (Majma’-uz-Zawaa’id 6/240)

They are the worst of creation and creatures. It is narrated in a hadith from Abu Dharr (Muslim) and in the same manner Abu Abdullah Ahmad bin Hanbal (ra) said: “The Khawaarij are an evil people. I don’t know of any people on the earth that are worse than them.” (Abu Bakr al-Khallal, As-Sunnah of #110) They are the worst of creation. Ibn Umar (ra) said about them: “They took ayat that were revealed concerning the disbelievers and applied them to the believers.” (Bukhari) Bukhari reported this narration under the “Chapter: Killing the Khawaarij and Heretics after establishing the proof against them.” Allah says: “And Allah will never lead a people astray after He has guided them until He makes clear to them what they should be avoiding.” (at-Tawbah 9/115) They are the dogs of the inhabitants of Hell. It is recorded in Sharh i’tiqaad Ahlus-Sunnah. (8/1232) On the authority of Abi Awfi (ra) that he said: RasulAllah (saw) said: “The Khawaarij are the dogs of the Hellfire.” (Tirmidhi; Ibn Majah; Ahmad; Ibn Asim, as-Sunnah; Abdullah ibn Ahmad b Hanbal, as-Sunnah and from Abu Uthman al-Bahili by Tirmidhi, Abdurrazzaq, al-Musannaf; ibn Abi Shaybah, Musannaf; Tabarani, Mujamul Kabeer; Tabarani, al-Awsat; Tabarari, as-Sagher; Hakim, Mustadrak; Bayhaqi, as-Sunanul Kubra) On the authority of Abu Umamah that he said: “The most evil of people to be slayed beneath the sky/on the face of the earth, and those whom they slay are the best of people, the dogs of the hellfire. They used to be Muslims and became kuffar.” I said: “O Abu Umamah! How can you say such a thing?” He said: “Rather I heard it from the RasulAllah (saw).” (Ibn Majah; Hasan hadith.)

Ibn Kathir said: “I say this group of people is from the strangest type of children of Adam (as). So how free from all imperfection is the One who varied His creation as He willed and initiated with His magnificent degree. And what is better than what some of the salaf used to say concerning the Khawaarij, that they are mentioned in the statement of Allah (awj): “Say: ‘Shall we tell you of those who lose most in respect of their deeds? Those whose efforts have been wasted in this life, while they thought that they were acquiring good by their works?’ They are those who deny the Signs of their Lord and the fact of their having to meet Him (in the Hereafter): vain will be their works, nor shall We, on the

Day of Judgment, give them any weight.” (al-Kahf 18/103-105) So the intended meaning is that these misguided ignoramus and these criminals in terms of statements and actions have united their view that of the Khawaarij whilst they are in the midst of Muslims. (al-Bidaya wa’n-nihaya 7/228) According to the narration of Ali (ra) when Ibnu’l-Kawwa asked Ali (ra) regarding those who were mentioned in the ayah (al-Kahf 18/103-105) He said: ‘These are the ahl-Harura” (Qurtubi, Tafsir; Razi Tafsir) Those are the ones who deemed some of the sins as ibadaah (taat) and performed for this reason. Even if these deeds were taat; due to their being among the kuffar these (acts) would not be accepted from them.” (Razi, Tafsir)

Tabarani narrated from Abu Umamah (ra) that he said: “The statement of Allah “O ye who believe! Take not into your intimacy those outside your ranks: They will not fail to corrupt you. They only desire your ruin: Rank hatred has already appeared from their mouths: What their hearts conceal is far worse. We have made plain to you the Signs, if ye have wisdom.” (al-e Imran 3/1118) is referred to the Khawaarij.” (Mujamu’l-Kabeer 8/325; Majmau’z-Zawaid 6/233)

Ibn Kathir narrates that in a hadith chain from Abu Kuraib (ra) in a chain from Wakia bin Rabia bin Sabih and Hammad bin Salamah from Abu Ghaalib, who said that, “Abu Umamah saw severed heads on the steps of the masjid in Dimashq (Damascus) and he was weeping. Abu Umamah then said, ‘The dogs of the hellfire (the Khawaarij) are the worst to be killed under the heaven and the one they killed is the best of people to be killed.’ Then he recited, “On the day when faces will be whitened and faces will be blackened. Then to those whose faces are blackened, did you become kuffar after your Iman? Then taste the punishment of what you disbelieved in. And as far as those whose faces were whitened, then they shall be forever in the mercy of Allah. ” (Al-i Imran 3/106) “Then I said to Abu Umamah, ‘You heard it from RasulAllah (saw)?’ He said, ‘If I did not hear it except once, twice, three, four or even seven times, I would not have spoken it. (Tafsiru’l-Qur’an al-Azim) Hakim narrated from Shaddad b Abdullah Abu Ammar (ra) said: “I saw Abu Umamah Bahili on the gate of Dimasq while he was standing over the Haruriyyah. He was saying that: ‘O dog of hellfire those who killed you are the best among the killers.’ He had tears in his eyes while he was saying it. A man asked him: ‘O Abu Umamah have you ever heard anything from RasulAllah (saw) regarding what you say o dog of hellfire? Or did you say it due to your own opinion?’ Abu Umamah responded him saying: ‘if I say anything without hearing from RasulAllah, once, twice or thrice then I would be dare about it. RasulAllah repeated it for seven times which I narrated to you.’ When he reminded him of the tears in his eyes, Abu Umamah said: “because they became Muslim and then after their iman they failed into kufr’ and recited the ayah: "Be not like those who are divided amongst themselves and fall into disputations after receiving Clear Signs: For them is a dreadful penalty, On the Day when some faces will be (lit up with) white, and some faces will be (in the gloom of) black: To those whose faces will be black." (al-e Imran 3/105-106)" Then he said twice that ‘this was regarding them’.” (Hakim, Mustadrak; Dhahabi confirmed its sihha.) Ibn Kathir mentioned the following narration as a tafsir of the ayah “Relate to them the story of the man to whom We sent Our signs, but he passed them by: so Satan followed him up, and he went astray.” (al-A’raf 7/175) while grading it as a sound hadith: “There is a hadith in the Musnad of Abu Ya’la al-Mawsili which is narrated from Hudhayfa b Yaman that RasulAllah said regarding the tafsir of this ayah: “For you I fear from the man who recites Qur’an the most, whose happiness is seen in his face and whom is known as Muslim however who is stripped from Islam and who throws his Qur’an behind him, who draws a sword at his

neighbour and blames him for being mushrik." Upon this when it is said to him "O RasulAllah (saw) in this case will the one who blames or the one who is blamed become mushrik?" he answered "the one who blames". (Tafsir) This is also narrated by Tabarani in as-sagheer and al-Kabeer from Muadh b Jabal. (Majmauz-Zawaid)

There are many amongst them that differ with one another. This is why they have divided into so many sects, some of which set out to fight against the other and at times, some of which deliver speeches against the other. Allah spoke truthfully when He said: "If it (i.e. the Qur'an) were from other than Allah, you would have found many differences in it." (an-Nisa 4/82) (al-Khawaarij –Aqidatan wa Fikran wa Filasufatan 54)

The Khawaarij will never come to an end until the appearance of the Dajjal and the Last Day. Every time a new generation springs forth from them, it gets cut off (i.e. from the Jamaa'ah). This is narrated from Ibn Umar (ra). (Ibn Majah) The Khawaarij will never come to an end. Rather, they will continue to exist until the establishment of the Final Hour. This is related from Ali (ra). (Bukhari). There will emerge from amidst them the Dajjal. In a narration it states: "...from their treachery..." And in one manuscript: "...from their ranks..." And that refers to a great army and this is narrated from Ibn Umar (ra). (Ibn Majah) There will be from among them those who will be with the Dajjal during the Last Days. It was said to Ali (ra): "All praise be to Allah who rescued the servants from them." He replied: "Nay. I swear by the One in whose Hand my soul is, there are still some of them that remain in the loins of men and verily, there are those amongst them who will be with the Dajjal. When Ali ibn Abi Talib (ra) overcame the Khawaarij on the day of Nahrawan, he responded to the people who came to congratulate him that Allah (awj) had finished them with his hands saying: 'The praise is for Allah. O leader of the believers who eradicated them at their roots!'. He said, "No, by Allah, they are still in the backs and spines of men and the wombs of women. And when are alive, they hardly leave anyone alone." (al-Bidaya wan-Nihaya, 7/295; 10/590) Shaikhul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said, "And this sign which RasulAllah (saw) mentioned would be the sign for the first people of the Khawaarij. But they are not the only people that are spoken of in these verses because He (saw) mentioned in other hadith that they would still keep coming until the age of the Dajjal. "It is concluded by the Muslims that the Khawaarij are not the only Khawaarij mentioned in the battles with Ali in the battle of Nahrawan." (Majmual-Fatawa, 28/495-496) Khawaarij will not only come out during one era form the ages only. Rather they have come out a number of times, until they will come out in rebellion along with Dajjal. So it is related from RasulAllah (saw) that he said: "A people will come out towards the end of time. It is as if this one (Thul-Khuwaysirah) is from amongst them. They will recite the Qur'an, yet it will not pass beyond their throats. They will shoot through Islam just as an arrow shoots through the hunted game. They will be called at-Tahaluq. They will not cease to revolt until the last of them revolts along with Dajjal. So when you encounter them, then kill them. They are the most evil of the creation." (Ahmad; Nisai; Ibn Abi Shaybah, Musannaf; al-Bazzar, Musnad; Hakim, al-Mustadrak; Haythami, Majmauz Zawaid) Narrated from Ali (ra) who said: "I heard RasulAllah (saw) say: 'Towards the last days, a people will emerge who will be young in age and have foolish ideas. They will speak with the best speech of the creatures. Their iman will not go past their throats. So wherever you encounter them, kill them, for indeed there will be a reward for the one who kills them on the Day of Judgement.'" (Bukhari; Muslim; Ahmad, Musnad; Ibn Abi Asim, as-Sunnah; Abdullah bin Ahmad Ibn

Hanbal, as-Sunnah)

There is a great reward for he who kills them. Ali bin Abi Talib (ra) said: "If the army that encounters them knew what was ordained for them upon the tongue of their prophet, they would only rely on that action." (Abu Dawud) In one narration from Abu Sa'ed al-Khudri (ra) and Anas b Malik (ra), it reads: "Whoever fights them has more right to Allah than them." (Abu Dawud) And in another narration from Abu Sa'ed al-Khudri (ra), it states: "Toobaa is for he who kills them and is killed by them." (Abu Dawud; Ahmad; Ibn Sad; Ibn Abi Asim, Sunnah; Lailaki, Sharh usulul i'tiqaad) and from Abdullah bin Abi Awfa (Ahmad) Abu Umamah (ra) said: "They are the worst of those who are killed under the surface of the sky. And the best of those who are killed is he who is killed at their hands." And he said: "These individuals were Muslims but became disbelievers." (Ibn Majah)

3- The Calamity of the Khawaarij is Fasid ta'weel

Hafidh said they had been called Kurra because they read and are ambitious in praying salah. However they made ta'weel of the Qur'an beyond its aim. They appointed view according to their hawa and exhibited their skills in zuhd, khushu etc. (Fath'ul-Bari, 12/296)

Dhul-Khuwaysirah directed revilement towards RasulAllah (saw). And he said to him (saw): Be just! And also said: I do not desire the Face of Allah by this distribution. Due to this, Khawaarij publicly manifest commanding the good and prohibiting the evil. However they do so without sincerity to Allah.

Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "And the first innovations such as the innovation of the Khawaarij were only due to poor understanding of Qur'an. They did not intend to oppose the Qur'an but they understand from it that which is not from it." (Fatawa 13/30) And he said: "And the Khawaarij do not hold onto Sunnah except that they distort its ambiguities." (Fatawa 13/48) He also said: "They have two well known qualities with which they separate the unity of Muslim and their leaders. One of them is that they leave out the sunnah and declare evil that which is not evil, or they declare good which is not good." (Fatawa 19/27)

Shaykhul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said: They considered to be from the deen is not actually from the deen, such as the viewpoint of the Khawaarij and other than them from the people of desires. For they believe in an opinion that is an error and an innovation, and then they fight the people over it. Rather, they declare as disbelievers those who oppose them. Hence, they become errant in their opinion and also in fighting those who oppose them, or making takfir of them and cursing them. (Minhaju's-Sunnah 4/527-)

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) said: "...The innovation of Khawaarij is opposite of this, it is because the essence of their innovation is their misunderstanding of the message of Qur'an. The aim of the Khawaarij at the beginning was adhering to both the dhahir and batin of the Qur'an. They did not have the intention to be zindeeq." (Tafsir'u Surat-i Ikhlas)

It is because their exertion was not based upon a correct foundation, nor upon authentic knowledge, it

became a misguidance, a plague and evil upon them and upon the ummah. And this is all due to their ignorance of the deen of Allah. But in spite of this, they had piety and worship, but since these were not founded upon authentic knowledge, it became a disease on them. This is why Ibn Qayyim (ra) said in his description of them:

"They have textual evidences, which they fall short of in understanding
So they have been given shortness in knowledge." (Nooniyyah, 97)

So they use texts as evidences but yet they do not comprehend them. They use as evidence texts from the Qur'an and the Sunnah concerning the threat for committing sins, but they do not comprehend their meanings. They do not refer them back to the other texts, in which there is found a promise for forgiveness and the acceptance of repentance for those whose sins are less than Shirk. So they accept one part and leave off another part and all of this due to their ignorance.

By submitting to the rest in al-Wasit, Ghazali stated there are two views regarding the hukm of the Khawaarij:

The first view: Their hukm is just like the hukm of the ahl riddah

The second view: Their hukm is just like the baghi. Rafii had chosen the first among these."

Ibn Umar saw them as the most evil among the creation. (Bukhari) This statement had been narrated in his Musnad regarding Tahzib ul Athar, by Tabari through Bakr ibn Abdullah ibn al Ashaj. This man asked Nafi: what is Ibn Umar's view of the Haruriyyah? He replied: He'd saw them as the most evil among the creation. They took ayaat that were revealed concerning the disbelievers and applied them to the believers." (Bukhari)

In a narration according to Muslim is marfu and sahih Abu Dharr describes the Khawaarij "They would be the worst among the creation and the creatures." (Muslim)

According to Ahmad with a jayyid (good) sanad, from Anas the similar had reached as marfu. From Bazzar, him from Sha'bi, him from Masruk and him from Aisha the following had been narrated: RasulAllah (saw) mentioned the Khawaarij and said "they are the most evil among the ummah. Those best among my ummah will kill them." The sanad of this is hasan.

In Tabarani it is narrated as follows: "They are the worst of the creations and creatures. The best of the creations and creatures will kill them. In the Abu Said Hadith mentioned in Ahmad it is narrated: "They are the worst among the society." And in the narration by Ubaydullah ibn Abi Rafi'in mentioned in Muslim: "The most hateful among the creation of Allah." (Muslim)

In a hadith mentioned in Tabarani narrated from Abdullah ibn Hibban his father, it is stated: "The worst of the dead the sky shadows and the ground filtered." Also the same is seen in Abu Umamah's hadith. In

the marfu hadith narrated by Abu Baraza mentioned in Ahmad and Ibn Abi Shayba it is stated "The worst of the creatures and creations, he said this thrice". Likewise Umayr ibn ishaq narrated from Abu Hurayrah and him through the chain of Ibn Abi Shayba it is stated: "They are the most evil of the creations."

All of these confirm the view of those who state the Khawaarij are kafir.

In the narrations from Abu Ishaq and him from Suwayd ibn Ghafala mentioned in Nasai and Tabari the expression "they expel from deen" is "They expel from Islam". Likewise in the same bab ,the same is seen in the narrations by Ibn Umar and Zayd ibn Wahb. In the narrations by Abu Bakra in Tabari and by Tariq ibn Ziyad from Ali in Nasai it is narrated as "they expel from haqq." Fundamentally there is a criticism to those who make tafsir of deen as obedience (taat). Likewise this has been mentioned in the signs of nubuwwa.

When it comes to the following statement: "There would arise in this nation (and he did not say 'out of them') a people" regarding this by sahih narrations from Abu Said there is no ikhtilaf.

According to this in Muslim the narrations of Abu Nadira from Abu Said is as follows: "RasulAllah (saw) made a mention of a sect that would be among his Ummah."

In another narration: "There would be two groups in my Ummah, and there would emerge another group (seceding itself from both of them)" The narrations of Dahhaq and al Mashriki from Abu Said is just the same. However in the hadith of Abu Dharr in Muslim the hadith is as follows: "Verily there would arise from my Ummah after me or soon after me, a group (of people)" From another chain Zayd ibn Wahb narrated from Ali (ra): "There would arise from my Ummah a people"

With these and the hadith of Abu Said can be reconciled as the ummah mentioned in the hadith from Abu Said being the ummah of ijabah (meaning those who show compliance/acceptance and those who submit)

And in the other hadith the ummah of dawah (call) has been meant (meaning those who the prophet had been sent to. This would encompass both the Muslim and the kafir).

Nawawi stated these are evidence of the fiqh of the sahabah and that they researched the statements. Also here there is evidence that Abu Said had made takfir of the Khawaarij and that he did not account them from the ummah.

"you would hold/consider insignificant"

"your prayers as compared with their prayers." As mentioned in the next bab in the narration of Zuhri from Abu Salama "and his fast as compared with their fasts." Likewise in the narration of Asim b. Samih from Abu Said: "You would consider your amal insignificant (compared to theirs)" Asim Najda had

described the ashab of al Haruriyyah as: They fast during the day and pray (salah) during the night and according to the sunnah will take sadaqa. This was reported by Tabari. In Tabari a similar narration is mentioned by Yahya ibn Abu Kathir by Abu Salama. Likewise the narration from Muhammad ibn Amr by Abu Salama is also mentioned in Tabari: "While performing ibadaah one among you will see his salah and sawm insignificant compared to theirs."

In the narration from Anas from Abu Said the similar is seen. Also In the narration bu Aswad ibn al Alah from Abu Salama the following is also narrated "your amal compared to their amal"

The narration from Salama ibn Kuhayl him from Zayd Wahb and him from Ali is as follows: "Your recital would seem insignificant as compared with their recital, your prayer as compared with their prayer" (Muslim; Tabarani)

Ibn Abbas (ra) said: "And I have not seen a people that are stricter in their exertion (of worship) than them. Their hands are like the calluses of camels and their foreheads are marked due to the traces of prostration." (Tabarani)

Ibn Abi Shayba narrated that the Khawaarij and what they undergo when reciting the Qur'an was mentioned to Ibn Abbas (ra), so he said: "They are not as extreme in their striving as the Jews and the Christians were, but yet they went astray." (Shari'ah, 27-28; Fathu'l-Bari, 12/298) **4- The Khawaarij Leaving Deen Quickly**

"From the Pray"

At the end of Kitabu'l Tawhid in the narration from Mabad ibn Shirin and him from Abu Said it is stated that until the arrow returns to its place they will not return. Ar Ramiyya is the thing affected from the action of throwing; the aim is for example a deer. In the muksim riwaya by Abdullah ibn Amr it is stated: "Surely there will be a group who will go deep in deen and pass clean through it". Meaning they will exit Islam very quick; just like when the arrow is shot from the bow by an archer with a strong wrist and the arrow goes in, through and out of its aim without anything getting stuck to the arrow. Likewise there will not be a trace left of that which is thrown. When the hunter looks for his arrow he will find it but he will not be able to find that which the arrow went through. To understand whether the arrow went through or not he will look at his shoot (arrow) and when he sees there aren't any traces of blood on it he will believe he had not been able to hit the target; whereas he had hit the target. He pointed to this with the following stement: "It pierced and went through its flank and blood" meaning although it (the arrow) passed through both of these it had left no trace. On the contrary the explanation to after it is coming out the hand will turn red had been mentioned in the section regarding the signs of nubuwwa. In the riwaya in Muslim by Abu Nadra and him from Abu Said is as follows: "Upon this RasulAllah gave an example to them: like the individual who throws an arrow at his game."

The riwaya mentioned in Tabari by Abu'l Mutawakkil an Naji and him from Abu Said is as follows: "They are like the one who throws an arrow at his pray. This man later will search for his arrow. He will find it

and look at it but he will not see any traces of fat or blood.” Neither fat/dirt will stick to it or blood. Likewise nothing from Islam will stick to them. Again in Tabari in a riwaya from Asim ibn Shamm after the word the aim thrown we read the following: “he will go to the arrow and than look at its metal however he will not see dirt from its tripe or blood on it.

The following is also included in it: “They will forsake Islam upon their backs” at this time he put his hands behind him. In the riwaya from the mawla of banu Hisham Abu Ishaq, Abu Said narrates: “As nothing stuck to the arrow nothing will stick to them (the Khawaarij) from deen.” Tabari related this. In the hadith by Anas narrated by Abu Said mentioned in Ahmad, Abu Dawud and Tabari the following is stated: “It is said unless the arrow returns they will not return to Islam”

In the hadith mentioned in Tabari narrated by Ibn abbas: “A tribe from Islam would pass clean through their religion/Islam like the arrow exits its pray. This pray will be presented to the hunter. They will shoot at it. Among them one of their arrows will pierce and exit it. Its owner will come and look at his arrow. He will see no blood has stck to its metal. Than he will look at the quill of the arrow and will see no blood on it. Upon this he will say: If I had hit it there should have been hair on this or blood on the arrow. However he will see there is no hair/feather stuck to it. They will exit Islam like this.”

It is possible to find in Ibn Majah the same with a much clear beginning. The narration of Bilal ibn Baktara from Abu Bakra is as follows: “The shaitan will get closer to them in the name of their deen.” In a riwayah by Abu Bakr and him from Ali mentioned in the musnad of Humaydi and ibn Abu Umar it is stated: “Surely some among the people will exit deen as the arrow goes through and exits its pray than they will not return forever. (Fath’ul Bari 12/307)

“And among them are some who accuse you (O Muhammad) in the matter of the (distribution of) alms...” (at-Tawbah 9/58) There is a witness to this in the hadith from Ibn Masud. He said: When RasulAllah (saw) was distributing the ghanimah of Hunayn I heard a man say: surely in this ditrubution the consent of Allah had been meant. Upon this this ayah was revealed: “And among them are some who accuse you (O Muhammad) in the matter of the (distribution of) alms...” (at-Tawbah 9/58) Ibn Murdawayh recorded this. Also in the version by Abu Said recorded by Ahmad the following is also included: “Abu Bakr came to RasulAllah (saw) and said: O RasulAllah (saw) surely I was passing such valley I saw a humble man who seemed nice. He was performing salah there. Upon this he (saw) said: Go there and kill him. Abu Bakr went there however when he saw that he was performing salah he did not find it appropriate to kill him and he returned. Upon this Nabi (saw) ordered Umar to go and kill him. He (Umar) went and when he saw him in the same state he returned. This time he orderedAli to go and kill him, Ali went but could not see him. Nabi (saw) said: Surely him and his friends will recite the Qur’an but it will not surpass their throats. As the arrow hits and exits its pray they will exit deen and will not return to it kill them they are the worst among the creatures. In the hadith from Jabir the same is seen. Abu Ya’la recorded this with a sika rijal. (Fath'ul-Bari, 12/312) **5- The Hukm of the Khawaarij**

Tabari stated: There is this in it also: Surely it is only permissible to fight and kill them after treating them justly and by providing evidence making dawah to them. Likewise in Bukhari the mentioned ayah

points to this. Those who have made takfir of the Khawaarij have done so with this evidence. Likewise this is the natural outcome of what Bukhari had done. It is such that he had held them equivalent to the mulhid and in a separate heading he distinguished the ta'weel doers with this. For this reason Qadi Abu Bakr ibn al Arabi in the sharh of Tirmidhi explains this clearly: What is correct is that they are kafir because RasulAllah had said: "They would pass clean through their religion/Islam", "I would kill them like 'Ad." In another narration he had said "Thamud". Both these tribes have been destroyed with their kufr. Likewise this statement is similar to his: "They would be the worst among the creation and the creatures" Whereas it is known that with this attribute only the kuffar are described also with the following "The most hateful among the creation of Allah". On the other hand, they deserved this name more for giving the hukm that those who oppose their belief is upon kufr and will remain in fire eternally. While Qadi Abu Bakr Ibnu'l-Arabi counts the reasons for them being kafir he states: "They are more deserving to this name for making takfir and stating they will remain in jahannam eternally to all those who oppose their own aqidah." (Fathu'l-Bari, Kitabu Istitabati'l-Murtad)

One of the mutaakhiruun (khalaf) imams who is inclined to this view is Taqiyuddeen As Subki. In his fatawa he states: "Those who make takfir of the Khawaarij and the extreme Rafidhi had certified this with their takfir of the distinguished personalities of the sahabah. Likewise according to this, this is a correct belief because this manner of conduct rejects the Nabi. He had given them the good news of jannah. Those who do not make takfir of them rely on the following: Surely the hukm of making takfir will necessitate there be no certain information regarding their prior shahadah. There is doubt in this view because we know that those whom they have made takfir of are very clean until the death reaches them. This is sufficient cause for us to make takfir of those who make takfir of them (sahabah). This hadith confirms this view: RasulAllah (saw) said: "He who says to his brother 'O kafir', then it returns upon one of them." (Bukhari; Muslim; Malik; Tirmidhi; Abu Dawud)

"According to us, for the reason that they make takfir of those who are Muslim for certain, as a necessity of what Shari had informed us they must be given the hukm of kafir. Just as stating "I am Muslim" does not save one or performing some amal does not save the individual who makes sajda to an idol from being kafir, those who call others kafir "stating we are Muslim" will not save them either. (Fath'ul Bari, Kitabu Istitabat'l Murtad)

When Abdulkahir al Baghdadi clarifies the foundation which the ahl sunnah unite on, he states: "It is said that those who gather at Nahrawan have exited deen because RasulAllah (saw) had named then those who exit deen. As they made takfir of Ali, Uthman, Talha, Zubayr, Ibn Abbas and those who submitted to Ali after the incident of tahkim, they said the Muslim who performs sin is also kafir. Those who make takfir of those distinguished sahabah and the Muslim will be kafir." (Al Baghdadi, al Farku Bayna'l Firak, 351)

Ibn Hajr says, "And what is correct is that the hadith was said as a warning against a Muslim saying that to his brother. It is said, "What returns upon him is his speaking ill of his brother and the sin of declaring him a kafir", and this is reasonable. It is also said, "It is to be feared that this will lead him into kufr", just as it is said, "sins leads towards kufr". Thus it is feared that if he continues in that and persists in it then

he will have a bad end. I prefer from these sayings that it refers to the one who says it to someone from whom nothing is known except Islam and there is no justification or reason for him to claim that he is a kafir. So in such a case he becomes a kafir himself because of that, and this will be explained. So the meaning of the hadith is that his judgement of takfir returns upon himself, so what is meant is takfir not kufr. So it is as if he passed judgement of kufr upon himself since he passed this judgement on one who is like him (i.e. a Muslim)" (Fathul-Bari 10/466)

"Whoever addresses a man with Kufr, or says 'Enemy of Allah' and he is not that, then it returns back upon him" (Muslim)

Nawawi said: "They differ as regards interpretation of this "returning", so it is said, "Kufr returns upon him if he is making that lawful", and this is far from the context of the narration, and it is said, "it is taken to refer to the Khawaarij", since they declare believers to be Kafirun (disbelievers)." (Sharh Sahih Muslim 2/50)

"Killing a believer is greater to Allah than the vanishing of the earth." (Bukhari; Muslim; Tirmidhi; Ibn Majah)

Imam Nawawi quoted from Qadi Iyad that Malik b Anas said that this hadith is related with the Khawaarij who were applying takfir upon the Muslim. (Sharh Muslim, 3rd opinion) Ibn Hajar commented this and said: "What Malik had stated should be explained. Some among them make takfir of those among the sahabah which RasulAllah (saw) had attested to their Islam and jannah. This takfir will also mean denying RasulAllah (saw)'s testimony and not making takfir of them through ta'weel." (Fathu'l Bari Istitabatu'l Murtaddeen)

Shaikhu'l-Islam Muwaffaqu'd-Deen al-Maqdisi (ra) says, "A group from the people of hadith believe that they (the Khawaarij) are kuffar and apostates and that their judgement is the judgement of kuffar and that their blood and their wealth is mubah (permissible to take)." And if they take themselves away to a place and they have power, then they should be moved against just as the kuffar are moved against. And if they are in rebellious to the imam, they should be made to repent, just as the apostates repent. And if they do, fine. If they do not, their necks are struck (they are killed). Their wealth becomes fai', and it is not inherited from by the Muslims, nor do they inherit from it." (al-Mughni, 10 Kitaabu Qitaali Ahli'l-Bughaa)

Ibn ul Wazir in his work Isaru'l Hakki states: "Although the Khawaarij had passionately objected to perform what Allah ta'ala had restricted and by making takfir of those who did sin against Him they exalted Allah ta'ala because they made takfir of the Muslim who sin, they suffered the most harsh punishment and they were severely spoken ill of. The one who makes takfir can not be sure of (not) falling in the same situation as the Khawaarij who made takfir. This is great danger in deen." (Ibn'ul Wazir, Isaru'l Hakki ani'l Halki, 447)

"Now it is clear that those individuals had attributed kufr to by us who are valuable individuals whose

iman is stable. Building upon this as a necessity of the information from Shari it is necessary to give the hukm of kufr. This is similar to their statements regarding those who make sajda to idols and matters as such. If we are to certify by the takfir ijma regarding those who do such things we'll say; This information which is likely to happen regarding those individuals, will necessitate their kufr. Even if they do not believe certainly in the good character of those whom they make takfir of, this is like this. Therefore having belief in the Islamic i'tiqaad and performing the waajib will not save them from giving kufr hukm any longer. Just as the act of the one who makes sajdah to an idol can not save him." (Fathu'l-Bari, Kitabu Istitabati'l-Murtad)

i- The difference between the People of Jamal-Siffin and people of Khawaarij

Abul Bukhtari said: "Ali was asked about the people of Jamal. It was said: Are they mushrik? He said they are fled from shirk. It was said: Are they munafiq? He said indeed munafiq do not remember Allah except a little. It was said: So what are they? He said Our brothers who have transgressed against us." (Ibn Abi Shaybah, Musannaf; Bayhaqi, sunnan; Abu'l-Arab, al-mihan)

Narrated from Hasan, that he said, "When Ali (ra) killed the Hururiyyah, they (i.e. his companions) said, 'Who are those ones, O Ameer Al-Mu'mineen? Are they kuffar?' He said, 'They fled from kufr.' It was said, 'Then munafiqun?' He said, 'Verily, the munafiqun do not remember Allah except for a little. And those ones mention Allah much.' It was said, 'Then what are they?' He said, 'A people who were stricken by a fitnah, so they became blind and deaf in it.'" (Abdurrazzaq, Musannaf #18656)

Narrated from Tariq ibn Shihab: "I was with Ali when he was asked about the people of an-Nahr. It was said: Are they mushrik? He said they are fled from shirk. It was said: Are they munafiq? He said indeed munafiq do not remember Allah except a little. It was said: So what are they? He said A group of people who have transgressed against us." (Ibn Abi Shaybah; Ibn Nasr, Tadheem Qadri salaah and Bayhaqi)

There is a break in the sanad of Abdurrazzaq but the sanad with Ibn Abi Shaybah; Ibn Nasr and Bayhaqi is authenticated and connected. As seen the phrase "brothers" does not appear in the ahadith. Indeed Ibn Kathir narrated a version of hadith which includes the phrase "our brothers" but he mentioned this hadith with a sanad from Kitabu Khawaarij of Haytham Ibn Adiyy, from ismail ibn Abi Khaled. (al-Bidayah wa'n-Bihayah, 10/591) Haytham is munkar (rejected) in the hadith. (Tarih Baghdad, 14/50) And Ibn Nasr pointed out the objection to Haytham concerning the same narration. However the isnad from Waki from Ismail ibn Abi Khalid with the wording: "A people who have waged war against us" is authentic. So this proves that the wording: "Our brothers who have transgressed against us" with regards to Khawaarij is from munkarat of Haytham.

Ibn Taymiyyah said: "Indeed it has been confirmed from the leader of believers Ali (ra), from a number of angles that when he had fought the people of Jamal, he did not take any of their offspring as slaves, he did not take their wealth as booty he did not finish the wounded man, he did not follow behind them and he did not kill the prisoners. And he prayed over those who had been killed from both groups at Jamal and Siffin. And he said: 'Our brothers who have transgressed against us.' And he informed that they were not kafir nor munafiq. And he followed

that which has been stated in the book of Allah and the sunnah of His messenger. So Allah mentioned: ‘and if two groups from amongst the believers fight...’ (al-Hujuraat 49/9)” (Risalah ahl bayt wa huquqihim, 29) Also said: “And killing those who are prayed over and have been named ‘our brothers’ is not equal to killing those who are not prayed over. Rather it must be said to him: ‘Who are the ones whose path in the worldly life is misguided, yet they reckon that they are doing good works!’ So he will say: ‘They are the people of Harura.’ So this is the difference between the people of Harura and the others who are named by the leaders of believers during his caliphate with his statement and his action, in conformity to the sunnah of his messenger. This is the correct view which can not be exceeded by the one who is guided.” (Risalah ahl bayt wa huquqihim, 31)

Shaykhul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said “And similarly the people of knowledge after them, this fighting (against the Khawaarij) was not like the fighting of the people of the Jamal and Siffin and other than them, from those matters in which no text of ijma has come, and neither any praise of the noble ones who entered into it. Rather, they were remorseful about it, and also returned (i.e. recanted) from it.” (Minhaaju’s-Sunnah 4/498; 7/406)

Imam Ibn Taymiyyah, said: ‘The second way of fighting the Khawaarij as well as fighting the people who did not pay the zakah, the Khawaarij and those of their like are not like fighting the people of the Jamal and Siffin. And this is what the majority of the scholars, the previous ones and the imams have stated and this is the aqidah of Ahlu’s-sunnah. And this is the madhhab of Ahlu’l-Madina, like Malik and other people and the Madhhab of the imams of hadith, like Ahmad and others. And they have stated this in more than one place. Even in their money, some of them said that it is allowed to take the wealth and ghanimah of the Khawaarij. In one statement, Ahmad said according to Abu Talib in Harawiyyah, they (the Khawaarij) had a piece of land in the village, and they started to go out and kill Muslims and fight Muslims. But the Muslims killed them and their land was given to Muslims. Then the land was divided into fifths (like what you do with the land of the kuffar) and 4/5 of which goes to the fighters that fought them or the amir of the battle can divide it and make it into an endowment for all of the Muslims. ‘And it should not be divided for only the fighters, like what `Umar did when he took the land of Egypt in Sawaa and made it an endowment for the Muslims. And Ahmad said that the land that is taken as booty, it is exactly as the money that has been taken from the kuffar. And in general this is the way that is the correct and decisive way (in fighting the Khawaarij). ‘The verses and the ijmaa have differentiated between this type of fighting (the fighting of the evil doers) and this (the fighting of the Khawaarij as mentioned above).” (Majmu`al Fatawa, 28/ 480-485/518)

It is narrated from Umar b Abdulaziz that he freed himself from the Khawaarij. (Ibn Abi Shaybah) And it is not possible for him to free himself from his ‘brothers’.

ii- Takfir of Khawaarij

Ibn Taymiyyah said: “So they are ignorant people who split up the Sunnah and the jamaa'ah due to ignorance.” (Minhaju’s-Sunnah 3/464) He also said: “And the first innovations such as the innovation of the Khawaarij were only due to poor understanding of Qur’an. They did not intend to oppose the Qur’an but they understand from it that which is not from it.” (Fatawa 13/30)

Before fighting against them and making takfir of them, it is a must to establish the hujjah:

Allah (awj) stated: "And We never punish until We have sent a Messenger." (Isra 17/15). And also said: "Messengers as bearers of good news as well as of warning in order that mankind should have no plea against Allah after the (coming of) Messengers" (an-Nisa 4/165).

Indeed Ali ibn Abi Talib (ra) sent Ibn Abbas (ra) to them. So he debated them. As a result many of them repented and returned back with him. It is said that they were 4 thousand in number and Ibnul Kawwa was amongst them. (Ibn Hajar, Fathu'l-Bari, 12/298; Ibn Kathir, al-Bidayah wa'n-Nihayah 10/567) Ali (ra) fought fiercely with them at a place called Nahrawan but only after advising and debating with them and clearly establishing the evidences against them. Ali (ra) debated them as well. So his proof was clearly established upon them. (Mawqif Ahlu sunnah wa Jamaa'ah, 1/137)

The scholars unanimously agree to the permissibility to fight the Khawaarij whenever they begin challenging and revolting against the leader, opposing the mainstream community of Muslims, and renouncing obedience but only after they've been warned. This has been mentioned by Nawawi (Sharh of Sahih Muslim, 7/170) and Ibn Taymiyyah (Majmu'l-Fatawa, 3/282). As for considering the Khawaarij to be disbelievers themselves, some scholars differ about this. There are two different narrations from Ahmad about this, mentioned by Ibn Taymiyyah (Majmu al-Fatawa, 28/500). And Ibn Hajar went into detail about the issue in "Fathu'l-Bari" by mentioning the various opinions of the scholars and their evidences (Fathu'l-Bari, 12/299-301).

And fighting the Khawaarij is in all times, and it is obligatory to repel them, by way of the pen, tongue or sword as they will never cease to emerge until in the midst of the last of them appears the Dajjal. Ibn Rajab said: "So as for the people of innovation and misguidance and whosoever attempts to resemble the scholars whilst he is not from amongst them, then it is permissible to expose their ignorance and to make public their faults in order to warn those who would otherwise take them as examples to be followed." (al-Farq banyan nasiha wa't-tayir 33)

The ulamaa of Ahlu's-sunnah wa'l-jamaa'ah believes that the Khawaarij are the proponents of a corrupt madhhab, and that they have innovated into religion and they have separated from the jamaa'ah of the Muslims. And the scholars have two famous statements concerning takfir of the Khawaarij. (Suyuti, Sharhu sunnah Nisai, 7/85) Some among the ulamaa do not implement takfir upon them. (Nawawi, Sharh Sahih Muslim, 7/170; Ibn Taymiyyah; Minhajus-sunnah, 5/248; al-Manawi, Faydul Qadeer, 3/50; ad-Durarus Saniya, 9/290) However, the companions were agreed upon fighting them. Despite this, they did not declare them to be kafir. (Ibn Taymiyyah; Minhajus-sunnah, 5/248) And they did not fight them until they had spilled blood that was unlawful and raided the wealth of the Muslims. So the Muslims fought them in order to lift off their oppression and injustice. They did not fight with them because they were kafir. So due to this, they did not dishonour their female family members and they did not take their wealth as booty. (Zayd ibn Fayad, Rawdatun Nadiyya sharhul wasitiyyah, 392)

Imam Abu Bakr al-Ajurri said: "The scholars old and new have not differed about the fact that Khawaarij

are an evil people who disobey Allah (swt) and who disobey RasulAllah (saw) even though they may fast, pray and strive hard in worship. So that is of no benefit to them, although they outwardly display enjoining the good and prohibiting the evil but that does not benefit them because they explain the Qur'an to mean whatever they desire and whatever falsify to the Muslims, Indeed Allah (awj) has warned against them, RasulAllah (saw) has warned against them, the rightly guided caliphs after him have warned against them, the companions and those who followed them in goodness have warned against them." (ash-sharee'ah 31)

There are many sahih ahadith narrated concerning killing the Khawaarij. RasulAllah (saw) said: "Tooba is for those who kill them (the Khawaarij) or who are killed by them." (Ahmad; Ibn Sad; Ibn Abi Asim, Sunnah; Lailaki, Sharh usulul i'tiqaad) "They are most evil of creation." (Muslim) "Whosoever encounters them, let him kill them; since there is a reward on the Day of Judgment for the one who kills them." (Bukhari; Muslim) "The Khawaarij are the dogs of hellfire." (from Abi Awfa by Tirmidhi; Ibn Majah; Ahmad; Ibn Asim, as-Sunnah; Abdullah ibn Ahmad b Hanbal, as-Sunnah and from Abu Uthman al-Bahili by Tirmidhi, Abdurrazzaq, al-Musannaf; ibn Abi Shaybah, Musannaf; Tabarani, Mujaamal Kabeer; Tabarani, al-Awsat; Tabarani, as-Sagher; Hakim, Mustadrak; Bayhaqi, as-Sunanul Kubra)

After narrating a hadith about the Khawaarij and their signs, Abu Sa'ed Al-Khudri (ra) said: "Twenty or more than twenty of the Companions of Allah's Messenger narrated to me that Ali was in charge of killing them." (Ahmad, Musnad; Abdullah Ibn Ahmad b Hanbal, as-Sunnah) Ibn Hurayrah said concerning the hadith of Abu Sa'ed al-Khudri, "In this hadith is proof that fighting the Khawaarij comes before fighting the pagans, mushrikeen. And the wisdom in that is that in fighting against them is a preservation of the capital of Islam, whereas in fighting the people of Shirk there is the seeking of increase (in capital). So preserving the capital comes first." (Fathu'l-Bari 12/301)

Asim bin Shumaikh said, "So I saw him (meaning Abu Sa'ed al-Khudri who reported the hadith about the killing of the Khawaarij) after he had grown old and when his hands began to tremble, saying, 'Fighting them (meaning the Khawaarij) is greater to me than fighting an equal number of the Turks.'" (Ibn Abi Shaybah 15/305; Ahmad, Musnad 3/33)

RasulAllah (saw) said, "A group will appear reciting the Qur'an, it will not pass beyond their throats, every time a group appears, it is to be cut off, until the Dajjal appears within them". (Ibn Majah and it is Hasan)

Az-Zarqani said: "Ismail Qadhi said, Malik was of the opinion of killing the Khawaarij, but he was of the opinion that they are given the chance to repent in hopes that they will return to the Truth, then if they transgress, they are killed due to their making corruption, not due to their kufr. And this is the saying of all of the Fuqaha who are of the opinion of them being killed and given a chance to repent." (Sharh of Muwatta Malik, 2/26)

Shaikhu'l-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, with regard to a helpless or weak individual of the Khawaarij and the Rawafidah (Twelver Shia), said: "It is narrated on the authority of Ali and Umar as well as the consensus

of the scholars of Islam that these two individuals should also be killed. Some scholars argue about the individual that is not fighting. However, they all agree that to kill them in a group as a group protecting themselves with the sword is allowed. This is because fighting is more general than killing.” (Majmua Fatawa, 28/476-479) **6- The evidence that in the Hadith: (good) intention is not taken under consideration in irtidad**

Hafidh Ibn Hajar continues to say: “One of those who is inclined towards these mentioned issues is Tabari with his attitude in the book Tahzib. After he narrates the ahadith regarding the matter he states: There is a refutation to those who state after deserving to be of ahl Qiblah as long as no one intends it, they will not exit Islam. Surely this claim invalidates the expressions mentioned in the hadith: “They will utter haqq and recite the Qur’an however they will exit Islam and nothing from it will stick to them. As known other than their mistaken ta’weel of the ayah in the Qur’an in unintended meanings, they did not intend to acquire offense of seeing halaal the blood and property of the Muslim. With a sahih sanad, Ibn Abbas narrated the following: Beside him (Ibn Abbas) the Khawaarij and what they said while they read the Qur’an had been mentioned and he (Ibn Abbas) said: “They believe in the muhkam however they are destroyed with mutashabih.” Besides the mentioned ahadith the command they need to be killed is confirmed with this hadith narrated by Ibn Abbas: “The blood of a Muslim who confesses that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that I am His Apostle, cannot be shed except in three cases: In Qisas for murder, a married person who commits illegal sexual intercourse and the one who reverts from Islam (apostate) and leaves the Muslims (jamaa’ah).” (Bukhari) In al-Mufhim, Qurtubi states: The view of making takfir of them is strengthened with the hadith narrated by Abu Said. –the hadith which is mentioned in the next bab- surely the dhahir meaning of the hadith is that they had left the fold of Islam without anything left from it. Just like the arrow hits and goes through the pray due to its speed and the strength of the shooter. Likewise on the arrow there will be no trace left from the pray. He had pointed this out with this statement: “He would then see at its feathers and he would find nothing sticking to them (as the arrow would pass so quickly that nothing would stick to it) neither excrement nor blood.” The Author of “Shifa” stated: “There is also this “We will for certain make takfir of everyone who compares the ummah to dalalah or who makes a statement which leads to making takfir of the sahabah.” Likewise the author of “ar-Rawda” had quoted and affirmed this statement from him in the riddah section. Most of the ahl sunnah usul scholars had accepted that the Khawaarij are fasiq however because they uttered the shahadatayn and performed the Arkan (requirements) of Islam they believed that the hukm of Islam was prevailing upon them. They had made takfir of the Muslim with fasid ta’weel and for this reason have become fasiq and this has dragged them to believe the blood and property of their opponent to be halaal, and make shahadah they are mushrik and kafir. Hattabi stated: “The scholars of the Muslimeen had made ijma of this; with their dalalah the Khawaarij are a sect from the sects of the Muslimeen. Likewise permission had been given to marry them and eat their slaughter. They believed as long as they continued to embrace the bases of Islam they (the Khawaarij) could not be made takfir of.” Iyad stated: This matter had almost become the most difficult matter to the mutakallim and others. When Abdulhaq asked Imam Abu Maali he explained it like this: ‘Surely entering a kafir into deen and a Muslim being excluded from it is a great matter in deen.’ Likewise Qadi Abu Bakr al Bakkilane had paused at this before and said ‘these men had not performed any open kufr. They may have used words which paved the way for kufr.’ In his work ‘The difference between Iman and Zindeeq’

Ghazali states: 'The necessary thing is to avoid takfir as opportunity is found. Surely it is a mistake to make the blood halaal of an individual who utters tawhid and performs salah. Mistakenly leaving (abandoning killing) a thousand kafir alive is lesser a mistake than shedding the blood of even one Muslim.' There is also this statement which those who do not make takfir of them rely on. It is the third hadith of the matter which after describing them exiting deen he (saw) states: "The archer looks at his arrow, at its iron head and glances at its end (which he held) in the tip of his fingers to see whether it had any stain of blood." Ibn Battal states: 'The majority had said the Khawaarij are not outside of the extent of being Muslim (Islam). The reason is in the hadith 'fawqa tamarra' he glances at its end (which he held) in the tip of his fingers to see whether it had any stain of blood) and 'tamarra' glancing contains doubt. In this matter when doubt is present against them they can't be given the hukm they have exited deen. The reason is with whomever the agreement of Islam has been established it is fundamental that they exit it with certainty.' Surely Ali was asked whether the people of the river are kafir or not. He replied: They escaped from kufr. I will say if this is stable from Ali in this case it will be ascribed to Ali to not have been informed of the belief which necessitates takfir of those who make takfir of them. Likewise him taking the statement 'yatamara fil fawqati' 'he glances at its end (which he held) in the tip of his fingers to see whether it had any stain of blood)' as evidence is also debatable. The reason is that in some of the narrations of the mentioned hadith this had been pointed out -also this will be mentioned later- that "It had not been able to do anything to it" and in some 'looks for stain of blood' the method of reconciling these is: He had hesitated whether there had been anything on it or not. Then, it had been understood that nothing had stuck to the arrow, as there had been nothing on it, no trace was left on it. Fundamentally it is possible to ascribe the ikhtilaf that the individuals among them are diverse. In this case the word 'yatamara' in his statement could refer that on some of them a trace of Islam could be left. In al-Mufhim Qurtubi states 'in the hadith making takfir of them is much clear.' Likewise building upon the idea of making takfir of them they are fought with and their properties are taken from them. Fundamentally this is the view of a group among the ahli hadith regarding the properties of the Khawaarij. According to the view that opposes making takfir of them, the hukm carried out for the baghiy will be applied to them. They will be fought when they rebel. There has also been ikhtilaf in the matter, will the person be killed after his tawbah who among them embraces their bid'ah and tries to spread this (bid'ah) or will he need to try and show his effort in rejecting his bid'ah; just as there is ikhtilaf in their takfir. The gate of takfir is a dangerous gate. There will be nothing left to evaluate with peace...In this it is also mabni that there is the factor of those Muslim who exit Islam without the intention of leaving deen and those who exited deen without the intention to choose another deen other than Islam. Besides this, surely the Khawaarij are the most evil among the sects of bid'ah from the ummah of Muhammad, the Jews and the Christians. Of course this last matter is certainly mabni for the idea of their takfir." (Fath'ul-Bari, Bab'ur-riddah, 12/295-313)

These are with absolute certainty; absolute evidences regarding a sect of people among the ummah. These individuals are at the summit of effort in ibadah, they have reached such degree that when the sahabah performed salah beside them they'd see their salah next to their salah, their recitation next to their recitation, their sawm next to their sawm as worthless. They narrate this from the most khair among the creations. Moreover these were mujtahid qurra (those who are occupied with the Qur'an) individuals who went to Jihaad with Ali (ra) in the path of Allah. In ibadaah while they had been in this

sublime position although the Qur'an they recited was in their favor they accounted it was against them. For this reason they fell in a dangerous and vile position. Their calamity was ignorance and fasid ta'weel which was not fitting.

Ibn Kathir said: "I say this group of people is from the strangest type of children of Adam (as). So how free from all imperfection is the One who varied His creation as He willed and initiated with His magnificent degree. And what is better than what some of the salaf used to say concerning the Khawaarij, that they are mentioned in the statement of Allah (awj): "Say: 'Shall we tell you of those who lose most in respect of their deeds? Those whose efforts have been wasted in this life, while they thought that they were acquiring good by their works?' They are those who deny the Signs of their Lord and the fact of their having to meet Him (in the Hereafter): vain will be their works, nor shall We, on the Day of Judgment, give them any weight." (al-Kahf 18/103-105) So the intended meaning is that these misguided ignoramuses and these criminals in terms of statements and actions have united their view that of the Khawaarij whilst they are in the midst of Muslims. And they agreed to travel to the cities in order to overtake the people and fortify the cities and then to send out delegations to their brothers and followers from amongst those who are upon their opinion and madhhab. These are from the people of Basrah and other than them, so they agreed upon this and their unity was based on upon this. So Zayd ibn Husayn at-Tai said about them: 'Indeed the cities can not be overtaken, since they have armies that you can not overpower and they will prevent you from them. However arrange to meet your brothers at the bridge of Jawfaa. And do not come from Kufah in groups but come out of it one by one so that you do not rouse suspicious.' So they wrote a general letter to whomsoever was upon their madhhab and methodology from the people of Basrah and other than them. So in the letter, they mentioned to them to meet at the river so that they may be one hand against the people. Then they come out, pulling out one by one so that no one would know about them. So he prevented them from khuruj. So they came out in the midst of fathers, mothers, maternal uncles and maternal aunts and they separated the ties of kinship. They believed, due to their ignorance lack of knowledge and intellect that the Lord of the heavens and the earth would be pleased with this affair. So they did not know that this was from the greatest of major sins, disasters and offenses. This was from that which was made to look to beautiful to them by Iblis an accursed devil who was banished from the heavens, who raised enmity for our father Adam (as) then to his children for as long as their souls inhabit their bodies. And Allah is the One Who is asked to protect us from him, by His might and power. Indeed He answers the invocations." (al-Bidaya wa'n-nihaya 7/228)

These nass from the ulamaa put forth the following:

Surely their sole ignorance and mistaken ta'weel of the ayah in the Qur'an in an unintended way, lead them to this disastrous position. When it it's like this, they still believe they are the carriers of the Qur'an and believe they exalt its flag. According to their claims they were fighting with murtad individuals who had exited the haqimiyyah of the Qur'an. For this reason they were sacrificing their souls, lives and properties for the sake of this belief. RasulAllah (saw) had surely said the most correct regarding them. They'll read the Qur'an although it is against them they believed it gave them acknowledgment. Whereas clear narrations have come which prove they exit Islam without a remnant left from it. Just like

the strength of the arrow which shoots through its pray without having anything left on it; the ummah in complete had agreed that they are upon dalalah and that they should be condemned. However there is ikhtilaf among them regarding the issue of the Khawaarij being made takfir or not.

Ibn Taymiyyah: "So the ummah has agreed upon rebuking the Khawaarij and declaring them misguided. They have only differed with regards to performing takfir upon them. So there are two famous statements in the madhhab of Malik, Ahmad and Shafii as well. They differed with regards to the kufr of the Khawaarij." (Fatawa 28/518) Khawaarij are misguided people and it is befitting that they be fought and killed until not a single one of them remains amongst the ummah because their harm is great and their evil is severe.

The difference opinion over the hukm of Khawaarij among the ulamaa is based on the deviation of Khawaarij on the furu of deen and not in the asluddeen. Mainly Khawaarij groups are classified as people of bid'ah, but their bid'ah does not cause them to go out of the religion from asluddeen. And there is no different opinion among the ulamaa about al-Ajaridah; a sect of Khawaarij who deny Surah Yusuf and label it a love story, in addition to the denial of some other verses in the Qur'an. Another sect of Khawaarij, Yazidiyya; who claimed that there will be another prophet after RasulAllah (saw) or Maymuniyya; is a sect of Khawaarij who reject some types of the prohibited marriages. These Khawaarij are out of the fold of Islam and classified as complete kuffar (non-Muslims), as they deny verses from the Book of Allah and their kufr is in the asluddeen. (Bagdadi, al-Farq bayn'al-Firaq, 168-170)

Ibn Taymiyyah said, "So the words of Ali and others besides him concerning the Khawaarij necessitates that they are not kuffar like the murtadeen from the basis of Islam, and this is what was clearly stated from the Imams, like Ahmad and others besides him." (Majmu al-Fatawa 28/518)

Shaykhu'l-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said, "And the way, seerah, of the Muslims has never ceased upon this (methodology). They did not declare them (i.e. the Khawaarij) to be apostates like those whom as-Siddiq (ra) fought against. And this despite the command of RasulAllah (saw) to fight against them, as occurs in the authentic hadiths, and also despite what has been reported about them in the Hadith of Abu Umamah, collected by Tirmidhi and others that they are "the most evil of those who are killed under the sky and how excellent is the one killed by them". Meaning that they are more harmful to the Muslims than others, for there are none which are more harmful to the Muslims than them, neither the Jews and nor the Christians. For they strived to kill every Muslim who did not agree with their view, declaring the blood of the Muslims, their wealth, and the slaying of their children to be lawful, while making takfir of them. And they considered this to be worship, due to their ignorance and their innovation that caused to stray..." (Minhaj us-Sunnah 5/248)

Ibn Hajar said, "Most of the people of usuul from Ahlu's-Sunnah took the opinion that the Khawaarij are fussaq and that the rulings of Islam are implemented upon them due to them saying the Shahadatayn and their diligence in the pillars of Islam, but that they only fell into fisq by their declaring takfir upon the Muslims, using as evidence a false ta'wil, and that lead them to permitting the blood of those who contradict them, as well as their wealth, and them bearing witness upon them with kufr and shirk. And

Khattabi said, 'The scholars of the Muslims have formed consensus upon that the Khawaarij, despite their misguidance, are a sect from the sects of the Muslims, and they permitted the marrying of them, the eating of their slaughter and that they do not disbelieve as long as they hold on to the root of Islam.'" (Fathu'l-Bari, 12/300)

Ibn Taymiyyah mentioned that no narrations from the Companions have been recorded mentioning they were disbelievers. None of the Companions used to declare them to be disbelievers, neither Ali nor any other Companion. Instead, they judged them as oppressive Muslim transgressors. (Majmu'l-Fatawa, 3/282; 5/247; 7/217) **7- Evidences regarding the Khawaarij being kafir**

Surely a great number of the muhaqqiq imams have clarified them to be kafir. For example those like the imam of the muhaddith Bukhari, the shaikh of the Mufassir Tabari also Subki, Abu Bakr al Arabi and Rafii. Qurtubi stated: Surely in the hadith the view of them being made takfir of is much evident. Let alone the dhahir of the hadith narrated by Abu Said shows that he also saw them as kafir. This is the most known view of Malik, Ahmad and Shafii. Likewise the evidence of the nass strengthens and supports this view. The evidence of the other group of scholars do not have any support other than making ta'weel of the nass. Likewise regarding this ta'weel, no evidence is considered. Let alone the dhahir of the nass also rejects this. As much as it is understood, these scholars have found making takfir of them as a mistake. The reason is the Khawaarij embrace the asl of Islam. For example Abu Sulaiman Al Hattabi is one of them. On the other hand there is no ikhtilaf that the one who abrogates anything from the asl of deen will exit the fold of Islam. In fact the hukm of Islam is made stable only with the assumption that asl of deen is present, when this is abrogated, without debate, the hukm of murtad will be given. This matter had been mentioned before.

The opposing ulama had used the statement of RasulAllah that 'the shooter will (be doubtful of his shot and) glance at it' as evidence. Hafidh replies to this and says in the other narrations "nothing had stuck to it from the flesh and blood" these will be brought together as such: At the beginning there had been doubt, after viewed very well, the person who glances is convinced nothing is on it. Also they had used as evidence "from my ummah" which are in some of the narrations. Hafidh replies to this as "Surely what had been meant in the statement 'in this nation' is the nation who had shown compliance. With the narration 'from my ummah' the ummah who showed compliance had been meant or it is possible that with 'from my ummah' their era had been meant.

Likewise the ta'weel of the ulama to this narration of this statement also carries this meaning: "They would pass clean through their religion/Islam" What had been meant here is obedience to the imam. This ta'weel rejects the narration which refers they will exit deen. Also when Ali (ra) had been asked about the Khawaarij their use of the statement 'they escaped from kufr' (Ibn Kathir, Bidaya wan Nihayah) as evidence is also like this. The answer is as Hafidh said: Surely if this riwayat is stable from Ali, it will be ascribed that Ali did not know of their kufr. Or he may have said this when they (Khawaarij) first appeared prior to them making takfir of the ummah in complete.

Fundamentally ta'weel can only be considered correct if there is evidence or a reason which may take us

away from the dhahir meaning of the nass. Now in the riwayat mentioned here, this is not under consideration. On the contrary these have come by stabilising and they strengthen the dhahir (apparent) meaning. Likewise the Prophet (saw) stated: "arise in this nation", "they would pass through the religion as an arrow goes through the prey", "as the arrow would pass so quickly that nothing would stick to it neither excrement nor blood." "They would recite the Qur'an thinking that it supports them, whereas it is evidence against them. Their prayer does not get beyond their collar bone" Whereas as it is known, the Qur'an is a hujjah in favor of the Muslim and not against them. Salah will not be accepted only by the kafir or if some of its necessities or arkaan are missing or due to actions which will nullify it. Other than these there is nothing left but kufr. There is this narration from the Prophet (saw) also said: "they would pass clean through their religion just as the arrow passes through the prey, and they would never come back to it." It is known that if they had been included then in this case there would be no meaning to his (saw) statement: "and they would never come back to it." Likewise "They state the truth with their tongue, but it does not go beyond this part of their bodies (and the narrator pointed towards his throat)." This shows that the heart becomes abstract from iman. As known for the health of Islam, iman of the heart is necessary. It is the sole means of salvation from the punishment of dunya and akhirah. Also there are the following words of the Prophet (saw): "They would be the worst among the creation and the creatures."; "The group who would be nearer to the truth out of the two would kill them."; "They would be the worst creatures or the worst of the creatures"; "The most hateful among the creation of Allah" and "The most evil of the people to be slayed beneath the sky and on the face of earth".

Surely these narrations are clear in means of their kufr. Let alone that which is said about them "They would be the worst among the creation and the creatures."; "The group who would be nearer to the truth out of the two would kill them."; "They would be the worst creatures or the worst of the creatures"; "The most hateful among the creation of Allah" and "The most evil of the people to be slayed beneath the sky and on the face of earth" are known in certainty to be valid only for the kafir.

If it is said: These riwayat are absolute and all of these should be ascribed to the narrations which include "the most evil among my ummah". This will be understood as the most evil among the Muslim. As necessarily known by sharee'ah, surely some groups among the ummah have fallen into the filth of shirk, irtidat and returning to the deen of their ancestors. This situation has been mentioned in the following ayah: "Did ye reject Faith after accepting it?" (ali Imran 3/106) "Make ye no excuses: ye have rejected Faith after ye had accepted it." (at-Tawba 9/66) "We appointed the Qiblah to which thou wast used, only to test those who followed the Messenger from those who would turn on their heels (From the Faith)." (al-Baqarah 2/143)

Also this hadith mentioned by Bukhari: "The Hour will not be established till the buttocks of the women of the tribe of Daus move while going round Dhi-al-Khalasa." (Fathu'l-Bari 13/82; Bukhari) Ibn Hajar said: Also in the hadith of Thawban (ra) related by Muslim and Ahmad it is stated that RasulAllah (saw) said: "Day will not come until a section of my ummah will have followed the polytheists and begun to worship idols." (Fath'ul-Bari, 13/81) These ahadith strengthens Hafidh uniting the narrations "from this ummah" and "in this ummah". Surely the statement "from this ummah" is absolute. With this either their past

status will be taken under consideration or they have only been an ummah which dawah had been directed and not an ummah who had complied with. The reason is the Prophet (saw) states: "Until a section of my ummah will have followed the polytheists." These had been people from the ummah. Moreover from the ummah that had accepted/complied. However, this had been their state prior to joining the mushrikeen. Only after they had joined (the mushrik) they are not from them (the Muslim) any longer. However both after they had joined and prior to it they had been among the dawah ummah. Likewise the riddah incident which took place after the death of the Nabi (saw) is also among this group.

From what had been explained we understand with certainty that surely the one who is addicted to this disaster and makes irtidad will this way be among those who join the mushrikeen who are also from among the ummah. In this sense the Khawaarij being the most evil among the ummah and the most disliked by Allah shows evidence to their kufr.

Likewise the Prophet (saw) saying I would destroy them like Ad- Samud reminds the truth of noth of these being tribes which had died upon kufr and for this reason they had been destroyed. It is also for this reason that he says: "until the arrow returns to its place, they will not return to Islam." There is also the situation that the rawi of the hadith stating this ayah had been revealed for this purpose and Sarahsee in his narration stating the ayah had been revealed regarding them: "And among them are some who accuse you (O Muhammad) in the matter of the (distribution of) alms..." (at- Tawbah 9/58)

Now it is clear that the cursed individual who objected to the distribution of the Nabi (saw) had made irtidad. Therefore as this ayah is regarding him, it also comprises his partisans because they are equivalent to him in kufr. For this reason in the hadith narrated by Sarahsee it had been said it is revealed regarding them. This understanding shows that Abu Said had seen them as kafir also because along with those who fell into kufr and irtidad at Zulhuwaysira are included in the ayah; he states the hukm of the ayah also comprises them (the Khawaarij).

The hadith narrated by Imam Ahmad and Abu Dawud from Abu Said also shows this: One of the narrator of the hadith, Asim bin Shumaikh said: "I saw Abu Sa'ed when his hand began tremble saying 'Fighting them (Khawaarij) is greater to me than fighting an equal number of the Turks'." (Ibn Abi Shaybah, 15/305; Ahmad, Musnad 3/33; Ibn Kathir, al-Bidaya wa'n-Nihaya 7/299)

Likewise the example given regarding them also confirms their kufr. Here the arrow due to the strength and speed of its shooter, shoots through its prey without anything from the pray sticking to it. As the arrow passes though the rumen and organs, the Khawaarij pass through Islam without having anything sticking to them. And as the arrow does not return back likewise they do not return back to Islam either. **8- The reasons for making takfir of the Khawaarij**

The disaster that dragged this group into kufr and its defect (Allahu Alim) is their making takfir of the sahabah. The reason is because this situation necessitates them being condemned in the things they narrated in the context of the Qur'an and Sunnah. Is not the shahadah of the fasiq rejected; than the shahadah of the kafir is much rejected.

In the tafsir of the following ayah "O ye who believe! If a wicked person comes to you with any news, ascertain the truth." (al-Hujurat 49/6) Abu Bakr ibn al Arabi stated: the second issue; whosoever fisq is stable, his shahadah regarding risalah will be baatil with ijma. The reason is, risalah is trust and fisq is indication that invalidates it. (Ahkam'ul Qur'an, 4/1715)

Nevertheless their takfir of the sahabah at the same time will necessitate rejecting the Qur'an. Let alone, from the Prophet (saw) it has been stabilized that they were praised and those notable among them have been given the good news of jannah. Now in the risalah it is known that the commands and restrictions will not be invalidated. Essentially in absolute sense the most dangerous of this is that their takfir of the sahabah necessitates their imputation in regards to what they narrated from the Qur'an and Sunnah.

Qadi Iyad stated: This way we will certainly make takfir of those who state the ummah is in dalalah, and like the al Kamiliyyah from among the Rafidhi who claim the entire ummah is kafir for different reasons such as the entire ummah after the Prophet (saw), those who did not present khilafah to Ali and Ali not surpassing in khilafah and besides this, him not requesting his right in being presented as khilafah; similarly those who make claims which refer to making takfir of the entire sahabah. The reason is they will have invalidated the entire sharee'ah with their mentioned claims. It is such that according to this claim, when those who narrate it become kafir, his and the narration of the Qur'an will end completely. Likewise (Allahu Alam) Imam Malik had pointed this out with one of his views when he had said those who make takfir of the sahabah will be killed." (Shifa, 5/ 427-428)

i- Revile towards the sahabah will indicate kufr

While Ibn Taymiyyah describes reviling, he stated: "Revile is the statement which is intended to degrade and to belittle. It is the statement which expresses the meaning of curse, disgrace and other words which express swearing, in the minds of people amongst different aqidah. This is the indication of the ayah of Allah: "Revile not ye those whom they call upon besides Allah, lest they out of spite revile Allah in their ignorance." (al-Anam 6/108) Reviling is the worst statement of which the tongue utters. When it comes to the statements which are accepted as aqidah and seen as the truth and just by some and deemed as there is no degrading nor condemning in it; however it has (degradation & condemnation) in reality and according to its ruling, is also kufr and the doer is either a murtad who exposes his irtidah or a munafiq who hides his nifaq." (as-sarimu'l-Maslul, 556)

In the tafsir of the following ayah "like a seed which sends forth its blade, then makes it strong; it then becomes thick, and it stands on its own stem, (filling) the sowers with wonder and delight. As a result, it fills the Unbelievers with rage at them" (al-Fath 48/29) Qurtubi states: "The fifth: Abu Urwa Az-Zubayri narrated from the son of Zubayr: we were with Malik ibn Anas. Before him they mentioned a man who belittles the sahabah upon this Malik recited this ayah: "Muhammad is RasulAllah" until up to "like a seed which sends forth its blade, then makes it strong; it then becomes thick, and it stands on its own stem, (filling) the sowers with wonder and delight. As a result, it fills the Unbelievers with rage at them."

(al-Fath 48/29) Malik continued to say: Whoever feeds hostility in his heart towards one among the ashab of RasulAllah (saw) surely he will be directed to this ayah. Hatib Abu Bakr had narrated this.”

Surely Malik had said the correct thing, and hit the target with his ta'weel. Whoever belittles or in his narrations condemns one of them (the sahabah) surely he will have rejected what Rabbil Alameen had said and will have invalidated the signs of the Muslim (Islam). Allah informs us: “Muhammad is RasulAllah; and those who are with him are strong against Unbelievers, (but) compassionate amongst each other. Thou wilt see them bow and prostrate themselves (in prayer), seeking Grace from Allah and (His) Good Pleasure.” (al-Fath 48/29) and “Allah's Good Pleasure was on the Believers when they swore Fealty to thee under the Tree.” (al-Fath 48/18) and other similar ayahs which include praising them and shahadah to their honesty and salvation: “Among the Believers are men who have been true to their covenant with Allah.” (Ahzab 33/23)

“(Some part is due) to the indigent Muhajirs, those who were expelled from their homes and their property, while seeking Grace from Allah and (His) Good Pleasure, and aiding Allah and His Messenger: such are indeed the sincere ones: But those who before them, had homes (in madinah) and had adopted the Faith,- show their affection to such as came to them for refuge, and entertain no desire in their hearts for things given to the (latter), but give them preference over themselves, even though poverty was their (own lot). And those saved from the covetousness of their own souls,- they are the ones that achieve prosperity.” (al-Hashr 59/8-9)

All of these show us that Allah is surely aware of their situation and their intentions... (After narrating some hadith he continues) Fundamentally there are many hadith in this sense. For this reason a situation regarding one of them as such should be avoided.

For instance like the one who condemns deen –and says:- ‘The surah al-Falaq and surah an-Naas (Muawizatayn) are not from the Qur’an. Let alone there is no stable proof from RasulAllah (saw) and other than Ukba ibn Amr included in the chain of revelation, there is no sahih hadith. Ukba ibn Amr is weak and there has not been anyone to give his consent. For this reason his narration is invalid.’ This is a refutation to what we had mentioned from the Book and Sunnah, in addition it is invalidating completely what the sahabah had narrated to us as deen. Surely Ukba ibn Amr ibn Isa al Juhayni is one among those who had narrated the sharee'ah to us in the Sahihayn of Bukhari and Muslim and in others. Above all, he is also among those who Allah had praised, attributed and glorified and with mercy promised great ajr. According to this, whoever attributes him or one of the sahabah with lies (fabrication) he will have left the sharee'ah, it will mean that he invalidates the Qur’an and condemns RasulAllah”

Ibn Kathir states: “like a seed which sends forth its shoot (Shat`ah) its shoot or branch, (then makes it strong,) able to stand on its own, (and becomes thick), youthful and long, (and it stands straight on its stem, delighting the sowers,) such is the parable that describes the Companions of RasulAllah. They gave the Messenger aid, support and victory, just as the shoot hardens the plant, that He may enrage the disbelievers with them. Relying on this Ayah, Imam Malik stated that the Rawafid are disbelievers

because they hate the Companions, may Allah be pleased with them (the sahabah) all. Malik said, "The Companions enrage them, and according to this Ayah, he who is enraged by the Companions is a disbeliever." Several scholars agreed with Malik's opinion, may Allah be pleased with them. There are numerous Hadiths mentioning the virtues of the Companions and prohibiting the criticism on their mistakes. It is sufficient that Allah (jj) has praised them and declared that He is pleased with them. Allah (awj) said: Allah has promised those among them who believe and do righteous deeds, forgiveness) for their sins (and a mighty reward) a generous reward and honorable provisions. Certainly, Allah's promise is true and shall come to pass and will never be broken or changed. Surely, all those who follow the guidance of the Companions, may Allah be pleased with them all, will be similar to them. However, the Companions have the better virtue, the obvious lead and the perfection in character, on account of which none among this Ummah will be able to attain their level. May Allah be pleased with them and make them pleased. May He place them in the gardens of Al-Firdaws, and make it their abode, and He indeed has done all of that. In his Sahih, Muslim recorded that Abu Hurayrah said that RasulAllah said, Do not abuse my Companions, for by the One in Whose Hand is my soul! If one of you spends the amount of Uhud in gold, that amount will never reach the level of one of them spending a Mudd half of it." (Tafsir)

Baghawi interprets the ayah as follows: "As a result, it fills the Unbelievers with rage at them." (al-Fath 48/29) meaning he increased and strengthened them so that they will be means of hatred to the kuffar. Malik ibn Anas said: Whoever feels ill will towards the ahab of RasulAllah will be included in the scope of this ayah.

In the tafsir of the ayah Imam Tabari stated: "like a seed which sends forth its blade, then makes it strong; it then becomes thick, and it stands on its own stem, (filling) the sowers with wonder and delight. As a result, it fills the Unbelievers with rage at them." (al-Fath 48/29) Meaning the sprout shooting out and strengthening, it erecting over its stem and with its all the beauty of the plant with its growth and maturing will please those who planted it "As a result, it fills the Unbelievers with rage at them." (al-Fath 48/29) Meaning the situation of Muhammad (saw) and his friends and the increase in their numbers is like this. It is such that the increased, enlarged and like this crop they developed and grew. Allah first clarifies their attribute then states the kuffar will rage at them." (Tafsir)

In As Sarim ul Maslul Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "A fuqaha group among the ahl kufah and others informed a certain view regarding those who curse the sahabah being killed and that the Rafidhi are kafir. When Firyabi (Muhammad ibn Yusuf) was asked about a (person) which insulted Abu Bakr. (Firyabi) replied: "Kafir". Then person asked: "Should we pray over him (his body)?" (Firyabi) replied: "No". Man asked: "What should we do? He used to say "La-ilaha illallah". Firyabi replied: "Don't touch him with hands, take two sticks and push him into the grave. Ahmad ibn Yunus had said: If a Jew and a Rafidhi are to slaughter a sheep each, I will eat the slaughter of the Jew but not the slaughter of the Rafidhi. The reason is he (the Rafidhi) is a murtad who had left Islam. Abu Bakr ibn Hani said: The slaughter of the Rafidhi and the Qadari can not be eaten. As known, the slaughter of the ahl kitab is eaten but the slaughter of a murtad is not. Now these people are submitted to the treatment of Murtad. The ahl Dhimmi utter their own deen. Likewise for this reason jizya is taken from them. Likewise among the elite

of the imams of kufah Abdullah b. Idris said: the rafidhi does not have the right of shufa this is only valid for the Muslim. (As-Saarimul-Maslul, 504)

“A group from among our friends had declared the kufr regarding those Khawaarij who believed it was necessary to distance from Ali and Uthman, and (they made takfir on) the Rafidhi who believed in cursing the entire sahabah -they (Rafidhi) made takfir of the sahabah and accounted them deviated-. In the work al Mukni Abu Bakr AbdulAziz stated: When it comes to the Rafidhi if he is among those who curse, he is kafir and will not be married with. Some scholars had said –Qadi Abu Yala had confirmed this- If he curses the sahabah and if this harms their deen and justice, they will be kafir with this. No if they only curse and do not criticize their deen and justice, for example, if one among them curses his father or one among them and with this he is only showing his anger, he will not become kafir.

In a narration from Abu Talib, Ahmad said regarding someone who cursed Uthman: He is zindeeq. In the narration from Marwazi he said: Those who curse Abu Bakr, Umar and Aisha, I do not see them to be upon Islam. Qadi Abu Ya’la had used this statement of Ahmad regarding them in absolute. He informs that the individual who curses the sahabah will be made takfir of. However in the narrations from Abdullah and Abu Talib they had paused regarding killing them. Likewise his view that hadd and ta’zir is necessary shows us that he did not give the hukm of kufr to them. In this case the statement of Ahmad referring that he would not see them upon Islam, carries the possibility that those who see this (type of) cursing as halaal are without doubt kafir and besides this those who don’t see this halaal the hukm of being killed is aborted. The reason is, he had performed this believing it is haraam, just like the performer of sins.

Fundamentally his statement that he would not see them upon Islam is also open to the interpretation that this can be regarding those who condemn their justice. Just like his statement after the Nabi (saw) they oppressed and became fasiq. At this time they made decisions that didn’t rely on haqq. Likewise his statement that their killing will be abrogated will ascribe their condemning without condemning their (the sahabas) deen. Just like this following statement of his: They had little skill regarding knowledge, strategy and courage. They were excessively devoted to dunya etc, and had embraced these with passion. Nevertheless it is possible to ascribe his statement to the dhahir. In this case this means regarding them –in the sense of their cursing- there are two narrations:

1- Making takfir

2- Explaining they are fasiq

According to this the narrations of Qadi and others containing the two narrations in their takfir are stabilized. Also Qadi had said whoever slanders Aisha (raa) in a matter which Allah had confirmed of her having good character, is without a doubt kafir. Here we will arrange the evaluation in two sections:

1- Their (sahabah) being reviled in certain

2- Explaining the hukm of the reviler.

(After this point he begins to list the evidences of those who make takfir of them (the sahabah condemners) and those who express they are not kafir but sinners)" (as-Saarimul-Maslul, 505)

"Those who say the condemner will be killed or made takfir of have their evidences. This evidence is among them: "Muhammad is RasulAllah; and those who are with him are strong against Unbelievers, (but) compassionate amongst each other. Thou wilt see them bow and prostrate themselves (in prayer), seeking Grace from Allah and (His) Good Pleasure. On their faces are their marks, (being) the traces of their prostration. This is their similitude in the Taurat; and their similitude in the Gospel is: like a seed which sends forth its blade, then makes it strong; it then becomes thick, and it stands on its own stem, (filling) the sowers with wonder and delight. As a result, it fills the Unbelievers with rage at them." (al-Fath 48/29)

As a necessity of their status the kuffar must be angry with them. If the kuffar are angry with them, who are those that are angry? Yes in this state, they got together with those Allah will perish and punish and had been condemned of their kufr. Whereas only a kafir can participate in the anger that due to their kufr, the kafir are condemned. This portion of the ayah explains this: "As a result, it fills the Unbelievers with rage at them." (al-Fath 48/29)

This is an evaluation regarding the hukm proper to the attribute put forth. The reason is the kufr in an individual is (makes it) suitable to rage at his friend. Now Allah had made the owner of kufr rage at the friends of Muhammad (saw) and in this sense whomever Allah had made rage at the friends of Muhammad (saw) this means that regarding him, he did carry the necessities of this, which is kufr.

In the Sahihayn, the hadith narrated by Anas is in the same manner: 'The sign of iman is to love the ansar. The sign of nifaq is to revile the ansar.' In another narration it is: 'Only the mu'min will love them and only the munafiq will revile them.'

It is reported on the authority of Abu Hurayrah (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) said: "A person who believes in Allah and the Last Day never nurses a grudge against the Ansar." (Muslim)

It is narrated on the authority of Abu Sa'ed al-Khudri (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) observed: "The person who believes in Allah and the Last Day never nurses a grudge against the Ansar."

According to this, whoever curses them will surely have deepened in his revile. In this state this will necessitate that he is a munafiq who does not believe in Allah and the day of Akhirah." (as-Saarimul-Maslul, 512)

"A section regarding the details of what had been said about them: To this cursing whoever adds Ali as a deity or that he was a prophet and that Jibril had mistaken who to give the risalah to and if he adds his deviation, there is no doubt of his kufr. Moreover there is not doubt in the kufr of the individual who

pauses at making takfir of such individual.

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) said, "Whosoever claims that ayat are missing, or have-been concealed from the Qur'an, or he claims that its ayaat have inner meanings that cancel out the outward Shari'ah actions, then there is no disagreement concerning his kufr. (Of them these types are named as Karamita and Batiniya also at Tanasuhiyya is among these.) Without touching their justice and deen, whoever only curses them for instance describes them with stinginess or being timid, ignorance, ahl zuhd etc this individual will essentially deserve ta'dip and ta'zir. However we can not pass hukm of his kufr for these. Likewise this will also be ascribed to the ahl 'ilm who do not make takfir of them. Whoever curses them absolutely and speaks ill of them, this is a point of ikhtilaf regarding them. The reason is the status of the one cursing sourced from degrading and cursing sourced from i'tiqaad is different." (as-Saarimul-Maslul, 518-519)

"And whosoever claims that sahabah became murtad after RasulAllah (saw), except for a small group that did not reach ten odd people in number, or that the majority of them were disobedient sinners, then there is also no doubt about the kufr of this one. This is because he has denied what the Qur'an stipulates in more than one place about Allah (swt) being pleased with them and praising them. Rather, who can doubt in the disbelief of this one? This aside, even the kufr of the individual who doubts the kufr of an individual as such is obvious. So his disbelief is specific, since this statement implies that the carriers of the Book (Qur'an) and the Sunnah were kuffar or disobedient sinners. And with regards to the ayah: "You are the best nation raised up for mankind." (ali Imran 3/110) And the best of the Ummah is its first generation, but if they were generally kafir and disobedient sinners, then this is the most evil of nations and the early generations of this nation are the most evil ones within it. And the kufr of such a person is known from the religion of Islam by necessity. For this reason you will see that those who make such statements are all zindeeq " (as-Saarimul-Maslul 504-519)

Cursing a particular believer is a major sin, (Ibn Hajar al-Haytami, al-Zawajir an Iqtiraf al-Kaba'ir, 2/93) and "The reality of cursing (la'n) is to distance from Mercy, which cannot be for other than kafir. Because of this, it is not permitted to curse a particular individual, unless it is known that they died in a state of disbelief, with proof. (It remains impermissible to curse an individual person) even if they were openly corrupt, like Yazeed, according to the relied upon scholarly opinion. As for Iblis Satan, and the likes of Abu Jahl (i.e who we know are in the Fire), it is permitted to curse them. It is also permitted to curse non-specific individuals, such as wrongdoers and liars, because what is understood is these people as a category, and it necessarily includes those who shall die in kufr. In such cases, the purpose of cursing would be to show that such a trait is a trait of unbelievers, in order to warn and keep people away from it. One may not intend to curse everyone of such a group, because if cursing one particular individual, such as a given wrongdoer, is not permitted, then how would cursing every single oppressor be allowed?" (Radd al-Muhtar, 3/416, Kitab al-Talaq, Bab al-Raj'a)

Attributing sahabah with kufr is the clearest sign of kufr of the doer, it is because Allah (swt) commands in the ayah: "the disbelievers may become enraged with them (Sahabah)". During a class of Imam Malik, it was mentioned that the Rafawid curse the Sahabah. In reply, he quoted the Qur'anic verse,

"Muhammad is RasulAllah and those with him are harsh with the disbelievers and gentle among themselves. So that the disbelievers may become enraged with them." (al-Fath 48/29) He then said, "Whoever becomes enraged when the Sahabah are mentioned is one about whom the verse speaks." (Qurtubi, Tafsir) And Qurtubi commented, "Indeed, Malik did well in his statement and he reached the correct explanation. So whoever belittles a single one of them or reviles him in his narration, then he has rejected Allah, the Lord of the worlds and he has nullified the Shari'ah of the Muslims." (Qurtubi, Tafsir) Ibn Kathir also quoted this from Imam Malik in the tafsir of the same ayah: "On this ayah, Imam Malik stated that the Rawafid are disbelievers because they hate the Companions. Imam Malik said, 'The Companions enrage them, and according to this ayah, he who is enraged by the Companions is a kafir.' Several scholars agreed with Malik's opinion. There are numerous ahadith mentioning the virtues of sahabah and prohibiting the criticism on their mistakes. It is sufficient that Allah (awj) has praised them and declared that He is pleased with them." (Tafsir) Imam Malik also said:

"The one who reviles the Companions of RasulAllah (saw) does not have any share in Islam." (al-Khallaal, as-Sunnah 2/557) "Whoever verbally abuses the Sahabah of RasulAllah (saw) he has no share in Islam." (Al-Khalaal, as-sunnah, 3/493)

Allish al-Maliki said, quoting Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani stated: "It is not permitted to denigrate Mu`awiya, because he was a major sahabah. It is not permitted to curse Yazeed or to declare him kafir, for he is one of the believers. Rather, we assign his affairs to Allah: if He wills, He will punish him, as stated by Ghazali, Mutawalli, and others. Imam Ghazali and others stated, 'It is impermissible (haraam) for preachers and others to transmit the killing of Husayn (ra) and to talk (at length) about it... for it can stir up dislike for the sahabah and their denigration, and they are the greatest notables of this religion, from whom the imams took the religion by transmission, and we took it from these imams through understanding. Thus, the ones who denigrate them are themselves denigrated, and only denigrate themselves and their own religiousness. This is the end of the meaning of what the great hadith master Ibn Hajar said." (Fath al-Aliyy al-Malik, 2/353)

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) said, "Whosoever claims that ayaat are missing, or have-been concealed from the Qur'an, or he claims that its ayaat have inner meanings that cancel out the outward Shari'ah actions, then there is no disagreement concerning his kufr. And whosoever claims that sahabah became murtad after RasulAllah (saw), except for a small group that did not reach ten odd people in number, or that the majority of them were disobedient sinners, then there is also no doubt about the kufr of this one. This is because he has denied what the Qur'an stipulates in more than one place about Allah (swt) being pleased with them and praising them. Rather, who can doubt in the disbelief of this one? So his disbelief is specific, since this statement implies that the carriers of the Book (Qur'an) and the Sunnah were kuffar or disobedient sinners. And with regards to the ayah: "You are the best nation raised up for mankind." (ali Imran 3/110) And the best of the Ummah is its first generation, but if they were generally kafir and disobedient sinners, then this is the most evil of nations and the early generations of this nation are the most evil ones within it. And the kufr of such a person is known from the religion of Islam by necessity." (as-Saarimul-Maslul 586-587)

Abu Butayn quotes Ibn Taymiyyah saying, "Whoever claims that the companions became apostates after RasulAllah (saw) except a few; not more than ten odd, or that they became sinners, then there is no doubt in the kufr of the one who says it. In fact, whoever doubts his kufr is also a kafir." then comments, "Notice how he (Ibn Taymiyyah) made takfir of the doubter, even though it is known for certain that one only doubts due to ignorance, and despite that he said what he said, with full knowledge that most if not all of these people (i.e. the Rafida) are ignorant and do not know what they say is kufr." (Al-Durar al-Saniya 10/358) Abu Butayn also says, "If a person were to say about the Rafida today that they are excused for cursing Abu Bakr, Umar and Aisha because they are ignorant muqallids, everyone from the laity and clergy would rebuke him." (Al-Durar al-Saniya 10/393)

Again Ibn Taymiyyah said: "If a person slanders them (i.e. the Sahabah) in a way that does not impugn their good character or religious commitment, such as describing one of them as being stingy or cowardly or lacking in knowledge or not being an ascetic and so on, then he deserves to be rebuked and disciplined, but we do not rule him to be a kafir because of that. This is how the words of those who were not regarded as kafirs by the scholars are to be understood. If a person curses them and slanders them in general terms, this is an area of scholarly dispute, depending on whether this cursing is motivated by mere feelings or religious doctrines. If a person goes beyond that and claims that they apostatized after the death of RasulAllah (saw), apart from a small group of no more than ten or so individuals, or that most of them rebelled and did evil, then there is no doubt that such a person is a kafir, because he has denied what is stated in more than one place in the Qur'an, that Allah was pleased with them and praised them. Indeed whoever doubts that such a person is a kafir is himself a kafir, because this implies that those who transmitted the Qur'an and Sunnah were kafirs or evildoers and that the best of this ummah which is described in the verse "You are the best of peoples ever raised up for mankind" (Al-e Imran 3/110) – the first generation – were mostly kafirs and hypocrites. It implies that this ummah is the worst of nations, and that the first generations of this ummah are the most evil. No doubt this is blatant kufr, the evidence for which is quite clear. Hence you will find that most of those who proclaim such views will sooner or later be shown to be heretics. Heretics usually conceal their views, but Allah has punished some of them to make an example of them, and there are many reports that they were turned into pigs in life and in death. The scholars have compiled such reports, such as al-Haafid al-Saalih Abu Abd-Allah Muhammad ibn Abd al-Waahid al-Maqdisi, in his book al-Nahi 'an Sabb al-Ashaab in which he narrated the punishments that befell such heretics. In conclusion, there are some groups of those who slander the Sahabah concerning them is no doubt that they are kafirs, others who cannot be judged to be kafirs, and others concerning whom there is some doubt regarding that." (Al-Saarim al-Maslool 'ala Shaatim al-Rasul, 590-591)

Taqiy al-Deen al-Subki said: "This refers to one who slanders some of the sahabah. But if a person slanders all of the sahabah, then he is undoubtedly a kafir. The same applies if he slanders one of the sahabah just because he is a Sahaabi, because this is demeaning the virtue of the sahabah and indirectly slandering the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). So undoubtedly the person who does this is a kafir. Based on this, the words of al-Tahaawi, "and hating them is kufr" should be understood as meaning that hating all of the sahabah is undoubtedly kufr, but if a person slanders a Sahaabi not because he is a Sahaabi but for some personal reason...The reason for the scholarly dispute

on this issue is if a person slanders a specific person it may be for some personal reason, or he may hate someone for a worldly reason etc. This does not imply that he is a kafir. But undoubtedly if he hates one of the two Shaykhs because he was a companion of the Prophet (saw), then this is kufr, and indeed hating any of the sahabah who was lower in status than two Shaykhs just because he was a companions of the Prophet (saw) is also definitely kufr." (Fatawa al-Subki, 2/575)

Narrated from Muhammad ibn Yusuf al Firyabi: "I heard a man asked Sufyan (As Thawri) about (person who) abused Abu Bakr, and Umar. He replied: "Disbeliever in Great Allah". (Dhahabi, Siyar alamun nubala, 7/253)

Narrated from Musa ibn Harun: "I heard a person asking Firyabi (Muhammad ibn Yusuf) about (person) which insulted Abu Bakr and Umar. (Firyabi) replied: "Kafir". Then person asked: "Should we pray over him (his body)?" (Firyabi) replied: "No". Man asked: "What should we do? He used to say "La-ilaha illallah". Firyabi replied: "Don't touch him with hands, take two sticks and push him into the grave". (Khallal as-sunnan 1/499; Ibn Batta, Ibanatul Sughra 160)

Imam Abu Zurah ar-Razi said: "If you see someone who is disgracing one from the companions of RasulAllah (saw), know that such person is heretic (zindeeq)! ..." (al-Kifaya fi ilm Ar-Rivaya, 97) Ibn Hajar al-Haytami said: "The imam of his age, Abu Zar'ah al-Razi said: If you see a man criticizing any of the companions of RasulAllah, then you should know that he is a heretic, because RasulAllah is true, the Qur'an is true, and what he brought is true. All of that was transmitted to us by the Sahabah, so whoever criticizes them is intending to prove that the Qur'an and Sunnah are false. So he is the one who most deserves to be criticized and the ruling that he is a heretic who has gone astray and is a liar and evildoer is more apt." (Al-Sawaa'iq al-Muhriqah 2/608; al-Isaba 1/10)

"The one who slanders Aisha (raa) with adultery even though Allah had exonerated her or denies Abu Bakr being a sahabah or the Islam of Ashara-I Mubashshere or the Islam of the entire sahabah or the four caliphates or any one among them is kafir." (Makdisi, Sharhu'l Iqna 4/29)

Yahya ibn Main said: "Whoever will abuse Uthman (ra) or Talha (ra) or any other companion of RasulAllah (saw) is dajjal, and he is not be recorded from. Upon him curse of Allah, angles and each human". (Ibn Hajar, Tahthib at tahthib, 1, #948)

Imam Awzai said "Whoever will abuse Abu Bakr, apostates from his religion, and his blood is permitted". (Ibn Batta, Sharh al-Ibanatul Sughra)

Abu Sayid Abdalkarim ibn Muhammad ibn Manthur At-Tamimi as-Samani said: "And nation is agreed upon takfir of Imamiya. Because they believe that; sahabah been deluded and they use to reject agreed opinion (of sahabah) and they attribute to things which doesn't suit to them". (Ansaab 6/341)

Abu Manthur Abdal Kahir ibn Tahhar ibn Muhammad Bagdadi, At-Tamimi Al-Isfarayani said: "Regarding people of desire like Jarudiya, Khashamiya, Jahmiya, and Imamiya, which use to make takfir upon the

best from sahabah, (we can say) that they are kafir in our view. It's not permitted to pray upon them in our view, and neither permitted to pray behind them". (Bagdadi al-Fark bayna firak, 357)

Ali ibn Sultan ibn Muhammad, (Ali al-Qari Hanafi) stated: "As for whoever reviles one of sahabah, then he is a disobedient sinner and an innovator by ijma (consensus), except if he believes this to be, permissible, as some of the Shi'ah and their companions do; or if they believe that he is rewarded for it as is persistent in their speech, or he believes in the disbelief of sahabah and Ahlus-Sunnah, then he is a kafir by consensus." (Shammul-Awaaridh fi Dhammir-Rawafid, 6, 252, 254)

Qadi Abu Ya'la said, "The position of jurists concerning one who curses the Sahabah, believing that such an act is permissible, is that he has committed an act of kufr. If he curses them but does not believe that cursing them is permissible, then he is guilty of immorality, and not disbelief." (Qadi Abu Ya'la, al-Mu'taqad 267; Ibn Taymiyyah, Saarimul-Maslul 569)

There are many narrations have been related from Ahmad b Hanbal concerning takfir of those who revile the sahabah: Abdul-Malik Ibn Abdul-Hamid informed me saying: I heard Abu Abdullah (Imam Ahmad) say: "Whosoever reviles sahabah, then I fear disbelief for him like the Rawafid." Then he said, "Whosoever reviles sahabah, then we do not believe he is safe from having rejected the Religion." And he said: Abdullah Ibn Ahmad Ibn Hanbal informed me saying: I asked my father about a man who reviled a man from amongst sahabah of RasulAllah (saw). So he said, "I do not hold him to be upon Islam." (al-Khallal as-Sunnah 2/557-558 with authentic chain.) Zakariyyah bin Yahya mentions he has heard Abu Taalib mention that he mentioned to Abu Abdullah concerning an individual who verbally abuses Uthman (ra) and people have mentioned this fact to me that he speaks ill of Uthman (ra),he replied they (the ones who speak ill) are zanadiqah." (Al-Khalaal, as-sunnah, 3/493) And Imam Ahmad also said, "They are those who free themselves from the sahabah of Muhammad (saw) and they curse them and belittle them. They declare the Imams disbelievers, except four: Ali (ra), Ammar (ra), Miqdad (ra) and Salman (ra). And the Rafidah do not have anything to do with Islam." (Usuolus-Sunnah 82) Imam Ahmad also said: "If you see anyone speaking ill of sahabah of RasulAllah (saws), doubt his Islam." (Imam al-Laalaiki, as-Sunnah #2359) Ibn Abdul-Qawi said, "And Imam Ahmad used to declare kuffar all those who freed themselves from them (i.e. sahabah) and whosoever reviled A'ishah (raa), the mother of the Believers and accused her of that which she was free from. And he used to recite: "Allah forbids you from it and warns you not to repeat the like of it forever, if you are believers." (an-Nur 24/17)." (Kitab Ma Yadhhab ilayhil-Imam Ahmad, 21)

Ibn Kathir mentioned the ahadith that are confirmed in the Sunnah and which comprise a negation of the claims of the Rafidah about the revelation. Then he followed this up by saying, "And if the affair had been as they claimed, no one from amongst sahabah would have confirmed that. Since, they were the most obedient to Allah and His Messenger (saw) during his life and after his death. So it is not possible that they would undermine him, such that they would give precedence to other than the one whom he had given precedence to, or that, they would defer one to whom he had given precedence to via his text. May Allah forbid such a thing, it would never happen! And whosoever suspects such a thing about the sahabah, then he has attributed to them that they united upon disobedience and agreed upon

stubborn rejection of the Messenger (saw) and opposition to his ruling and his text. And whosoever from amongst the people reaches such a level, then he has thrown off the yoke of Islam from his neck and he has disbelieved according to the, 'ijma' (consensus) of the Imams and outstanding personalities. And spilling his blood is more lawful than spilling wine." (al-Bidayah wan-Nihayah 5/252)

Ibn Qayyim said: "Zayd bin Aslam said: 'Those on whom Allah has bestowed His Grace; they are RasulAllah (saw) Abu Bakr (ra) and Umar (ra).' There is no doubt that those who are blessed are those who follow the Messenger. As for those who have anger upon them, then they are those who do not follow him. Those who followed and obeyed RasulAllah (saw) from the Ummah, were his sahabah and his family. Those who followed RasulAllah (saw) the most from his sahabah; who were regarded as his sight and hearing, were Abu Bakr (ra) and Umar (ra). Those who are the severest in opposition to RasulAllah (saw) are the Rafidah. Their opposition to him is well-known amongst all the sects of the Ummah. This is why the Rafidah hate the Sunnah and its people, they have enmity towards it and its people so, and they are the enemies of his (saw) Sunnah. Family of RasulAllah (saw) and those from their children who follow them are perfect heirs; rather they are his true heirs. So it becomes clear that the Siraat al-Mustaqim is the path of sahabah of RasulAllah (saw) and his followers. The path of the people, who have the Anger of Allah upon them and are upon misguidance, is the path of the Rafidah. In this exact, same way the Khawaarij are refuted, since their enmity towards the Companions is well known." (Madarij as-Salikin, 1/95)

Abul-Mahaasin al-Waasiti said: "Indeed, by their takfir of sahabah of RasulAllah (saw), they have declared disbelievers those whose praise has been confirmed in the Qur'an by the statement of Allah (swt): "So that you may be witnesses over mankind." (al-Baqarah 2/143) And Allah (jj) has testified that they are not disbelievers with His statement: "And if these ones disbelieve therein, then We have entrusted it to a people who are not disbelievers therein." (al-An'am 6/89)." (al-Munadharah bayna Ahlus-Sunnah war-Rafidah 66)

Imam Tahawi states, "We love the companions of RasulAllah (saw), without going overboard in our love of anyone of them or remaining aloof (tabarra) from any of them. We hate those who hate them or speak ill of them and we only speak well of them. Loving them is a religious act and an expression of iman and righteousness, while hating them is an act of kufr, nifaq and transgression." (Sharh al-Aqidah at-Tahawiyyah, 528)

9- Khawaarij and irtidad among ahl-qiblah

From these long narrations with the will and help of Allah it has been stabilized that: Surely the kufr of the individual who condemns the sahabah in their deen and justice, describing them as kafir or fasiq is clear and definite. Furthermore this is among the matters necessarily known in Islam. The reason is statements as such will mean condemning them in their narrations and denying the Qur'an which praises and honors them. Fundamentally the sharee'ah has accounted degrading the sahabah as the sign of kufr of its owner. This is a suitable attribute and is suitable to be a reason for hukm. It is known that the Khawaarij had made takfir of Ali and Muawiya and those who helped them.

We can summarize this hadith regarding the Khawaarij like the imam of the mufassir imam Tabari explained: In this hadith there is a refutation to the thought of- after deserving the attribute of Muslim, from the ahl qiblah knowingly and acknowledging without the intention of exiting the fold of Islam no one will exit Islam. The reason is this view negates the expression in the hadith.

"They will state haqq and recite Qur'an; nevertheless they will exit Islam with nothing left from it."

Likewise Hafidh had stated: From this hadith the outcome is 'without the intention of exiting deen, also without the intention of choosing another deen over Islam, some among the Muslim will exit deen'. This outcome relies on the thought they must absolutely be made takfir of.

With this it is understood that surely this regulation Hafidh mentions is stable by all those who assimilate to their takfir.

There is also the fact that matters as such are matters which do not touch upon asl of deen. And what if it does touch upon the asl of deen, then what would the hukm be?

Now can anyone surely dare to say that valuable sahabah Abu Said al Khudri, the imam of the muhaddith Bukhari, the imam of the mufassir Tabari, Qadi Abubakr ibn al Arabi, Subki, Rafii and others are ahl bid'ah?

The reason is they had given the hukm of kafir to the Khawaarij. Let alone they did not excuse them with things such as ignorance, being mistaken and ta'weel.

Bukhari relayed the ahadith regarding Khawaarij on the chapter 'Kitabu'l-istitabatu'l-murtaddeen'.

Abu Aliya (ra) stated: "I read the Qur'an ten years after death of your prophet. So Allah bestowed upon me two blessings, I do not know which of the two is better: that He guided me to Islam or He did not make me a Haroori." (Related with sahih chain by Abdurrazzaq; Ibn Sa'd; al-Lailake, Sharh Usulu'l-i'tiqaad; Ibn Abi Zammaan, usulus'sunnah; al-Harawi, dhammu'l-kalam; adh-Dhahabi, siyar)

Allah (awj) stated: "And whosoever contradicts and opposes the Messenger after the right path has been clearly shown to him and follows other than the path of the believers. We shall keep him in the path he has chosen and burn him in Hell, what an evil destination." (an-Nisa 4/115) **c- The Qadariyyah and Their Hukm**

In the latter days of the Sahabah, the sect of the Qadariyyah emerged. They deny and negate the Qadar (Divine Decree). They say that all that occurs in existence is not due to any Qadar (Divine Decree) or Qadaa (the occurrence of that Divine Decree) from Allah (swt). They denied the Divine Pre-Determination and moreover claimed that Allah has no power of His creation and that mankind is totally independent of His Will and Power. For this reason they denied and they negate the sixth pillar of Islam which is iman in Qadar, the good of it and the bad of it and all from Allah (jj). They are called the

Qadariyyah, and they are also named the Majoos (Magians) of this Ummah due to their claim that everyone creates his own actions without any prior decree from Allah. Therefore they affirm that there are creators along with Allah just as the Majoos (Magians) say: The creation has two creators, Light and Darkness. Light created good and Darkness created evil. With this view of theirs, they have exceeded the Majoos (Magians) by affirming numerous creators along with Allah when they said: The servant creates his own actions independent from Allah. Allah is free from and high above their claims. And there is also a hadith which RasulAllah (saw) had warned, regarding them by saying, "the Qadariyyah are the Magians of this ummah." Qadariyyah was initiated at the hands of Ma'bad al-Juhani, and they denied destiny. Ja'd ibn Dirham, another pioneer of the sect, was the first to claim the Qur'an is created. Abdullah ibn Umar (ra), Jabir ibn Abdullah (ra), Abu Hurayrah (ra), Abullah ibn Abbas (ra) and Anas ibn Malik (ra), abjured the Qadariyyah and instructed people not to greet them with salam, nor to perform salah over their dead, nor even to visit their sick.

Third evidence from the sunnah is the hadith regarding the Qadariyyah.

It is narrated on the authority of Yahya b. Ya'mur that the first man who discussed about Qadr (Divine Decree) in Basra was Ma'bad al-Juhani. I along with Humaid b. 'Abdur-Rahman Himyari set out for pilgrimage or for 'Umrah and said: Should it so happen that we come into contact with one of the Companions of RasulAllah (saw) we shall ask him about what is talked about Taqdir (Division Decree). Accidentally we came across Abdullah ibn Umar ibn al-Khattab, while he was entering the mosque. My companion and I surrounded him. One of us (stood) on his right and the other stood on his left. I expected that my companion would authorize me to speak. I therefore said: Abu Abdur-Rahman! There have appeared some people in our land who recite the Qur'an and pursue knowledge. And then after talking about their affairs, added: They (such people) claim that there is no such thing as Divine Decree and events are not predestined. He (Abdullah ibn Umar) said: When you happen to meet such people tell them that I have nothing to do with them and they have nothing to do with me. And verily they are in no way responsible for my (belief). Abdullah ibn Umar swore by Him (the Lord) (and said): If any one of them (who does not believe in the Divine Decree) had with him gold equal to the bulk of (the mountain) Uhud and then, spent it (in the way of Allah), Allah would not accept it unless he affirmed his faith in Divine Decree..." (Muslim)

Nawawi informs Qadi Iyad had said: I saw some who say yataka'aruna instead of yatakaffar and they made tafsir of it as they want to deepen in deen in seclusion and secretively. For instance when someone mentions weird things taka'ra will be said. In the narration of Abu Ya'la al Mawsili it is yatafakkahuna. This is the dhahir of the the statement which mentions his and their situation. Meaning Ibn Ya'mar mentioned their situation and their virtuous attributes in 'ilm and their ijthihad in study and given importance. "They (such people) claim that there is no such thing as Divine Decree and events are not predestined". Meaning they claimed it was impulsive, that it had no prior admiration and that it became without Allah having any 'ilm regarding it. —Likewise we had previously mentioned the details of the baatil madhhabs.- This statement is actually the view of those who are marginal. It is not the view of all among the Qadariyyah... Ibn Umar (ra) said: "When you happen to meet such people tell them that I have nothing to do with them and they have nothing to do with me. And verily they are in no way

responsible for my (belief)" It is very clear that Ibn Umar had made takfir of the Qadariyyah with this statement. Qadi Iyad had said: "This is regarding the first Qadariyyah who negated the ilm of Allah regarding them. Whoever states this, is without debate kafir." (Nawawi Sharh 1/150)

Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "When it comes to the fact that prior to an article being formed it is inevitable to Allah; this reality contains no doubt. Being recorded before Him or the angels is like this. Likewise the book and sunnah guides to this. Nevertheless the narrations have come within this frame. This 'ilm and it being written (Qadar) is the qadar most among the Qadariyyah deny. They claim Allah can only know the actions of His slaves after they (the actions) have occurred. These are kuffar. Shafii, Ahmad and other imams have made takfir (of them)." (Fatawa 2/152) **1- The Sects of Qadariyyah**

"Surely in the matter of iman in Qadar those on the verge of Qadariyyah have debated. They believed the ilm existed in Allah prior did not negate the commands and restrictions. They are divided into two groups: The first group acknowledges command-restriction and reward-punishment however they deny the possibility that prior to these there could be qada, qadar and the written. These individuals had emerged around the end of the era of the sahabah. When the sahabah heard their bid'ah they made baraa from them. Likewise Abdullah ibn Umar, Abdullah ibn Abbas, Jabir ibn Abdullah, Wasila ibn al Aska' abd other sahabah rejected them and made baraa from them. Imams such as Malik, Shafii and Ahmad had recorded the kufr of those individuals who denied the 'ilm of Allah being antecedent. Along with accepting the 'ilm of Allah being antecedent and His written record, the second group claimed this made needless from command, restriction and amal; therefore there was no need for amal and furthermore whoever's happiness had been predestined for even if in any case he had no amal, he will enter jannah and for whom ever it was predestined to be rebellious regardless of his actions, he is rebellious. These individuals are not among the group accounted as ahl makala. Surely mostly the ignorant among people say this. These are more kafir and method-wise much deviated. That which these individuals say, would mean the invalidation of command-restriction; halaal-haram and reward-punishment. They are much deeper in kufr than the Jews and the Nasara (Christians). These are those individuals who asked questions about the views of the one who asks questions.

When it comes to most of the Qadariyyah: They accept predestined 'ilm and written, however at the same time they deny that Allah created the actions of the slaves and their will power in incidents. The Jabri Qadariyyah who claims that the slave does not have any qudrah or real will power and that he is not the real doer; had become opposition to them. All these sects are deviated bid'ah doers.

The most evil among these types are like the mushrik those who claim the creation of actions and will power in incidents are a barrier to commands and restrictions. The mushrik had claimed: "If Allah had wished, we should not have given partners to Him nor would our fathers." (al-Anam 6/148) These are more kafir than the Jews and the Christians. The meaning of their statements is the invalidation of all command and restriction. (Fatawa, 8/288-289)

2- bid'ah is not only one type

As understood from this claim surely there is not only one type of bid'ah. The bid'ah doers can sometimes really go to the extremes. It is such that with this they degrade to the level of open kufr. Sometimes in the degree of bid'ah yet they pause at the kufr of interpretation. For this reason it is necessary to explain the starting point of the bid'ah which the scholars mention while explaining the hukm of the ahl bid'ah. Is this the degree of open kufr or the degree of kufr of bid'ah and interpretation?

Likewise it is understood that denial of the 'ilm of Allah on command and restriction and the denial of antecedence of qada and qadar is kufr which is distant from ikhtilaf. Uttering these and only these will make commands, restrictions and amal needless. Also the hukm of those who claim entering jannah and jahannam is not restricted with amal; is surely they are ignorant and kafir and even more kafir than the Jewish and the Nasara. Fundamentally these are not even accounted among the Muslim groups.

Surely those who defend the view that the reason for acting upon actions is the written record which is qadar and taqdir are also more kafir than the Jewish and the Nasara. The reason is the Jewish and the Nasara accept some of the commands and restrictions and reject some. These (Qadariyyah) do not accept any of the commands-restriction and celestial traits.

Along with uttering antecedent 'ilm and the written (recorded) those who deny the creation of the actions of slaves and the will power in actions are deviated bid'ah doers. Regarding their takfir there is a well known debate among the ulama.

In the sharh of the hadith of Jibril Ibn Rajab said: "For this kalima (iman in qadar) Ibn Umar (ra) had asserted this hadith against those who deny qadar and claimed actions are impulsive. They stated: Prior to actions happening without the antecedence of Allah they occur suddenly without preparation. Abdullah ibn Umar had really become angry with them and had made baraa from them. In this frame he had informed them that there amal will not be accepted until they have iman in qadar..."

3- The proof of qadim 'antecedent' 'ilm is evidence against the Qadariyyah

Many of the salaf imams had said: "Debate about antecedent 'ilm with the Qadariyyah if they accept become only enemies with them, if they deny certainly make takfir of them." With this they had desired: whoever denies the former antecedent 'ilm regarding the actions of the slaves and that prior to creating them Allah (jj) had divided them as rebellious and content and that He had recorded this in a protected book beside Him; surely he will have denied the Qur'an. As a result with this he will be made takfir of. Know if he utters this and denies Allah had created the actions of His slaves and that He willed this and with kawni (existential) will power He willed this; show animosity to them also. The reason is this which they have accepted, is evidence against them in the sense of that which they deny. In regards to their takfir, among the ulama there is a well known ikhtilaf. When it comes to those who deny the antecedent 'ilm, Shafii and Ahmad had recorded it is necessary they are made takfir of. Also other than these other imams of Islam had stated this. (Jami'u Ulum wa'l Hukm, 25)

In these narrations regarding the tribe which with the logic of believing Allah is distant from all defects,

falls in the situation of making (Allah) deficient (wa a'udhu billah) it is understood that they are not conscious of this which they are doing and saying. Let alone they do not intend kufr at all. Moreover they are individuals who research the truth and who try to benefit from the data of 'ilm. With this when this state of theirs reaches Abdullah ibn Umar (ra) he completely makes baraa from them. As known this attitude is only performed against the kafir. Likewise when Allah commands us to distance (make baraa) from the kafir He states: "We are clear of you and of whatever ye worship besides Allah: we have rejected you" (al-Mumtahina 60/4) Likewise when He informs of distancing from the rebellions He informs: "I am free (of responsibility) for what ye do!" (ash-Shuara 26/216)

Now baraa will not be done to the Muslim but only his actions. It means that baraa will only be made in complete to a mushrik individual.

The valuable sahabah did not ask those who had asked the questions did you provide evidence to them? Did you rid their doubts? Did the conditions of making takfir of them occur? Did the barriers lift or did they not? On the contrary his statement regarding them only by settling with hearing their words their takfir and baraa from them is very clear. In this sense, the notable imams had submitted to him in this hukm also. Moreover as Qadi Iyad said surely the one who utters this is without doubt kafir. As known this situation they had fallen in is a situation further than shirk. When it is as such what would be the state when it (shirk) is performed?

Now, where are those accusers? They accuse and abuse the ones who give the hukm mushrik to those who fall in the position of performing ibadah to other than Allah (jj). An individual as such would not have a ta'weel to rely on nor is there any doubt, rather they abrogate the essence and base of everything; which is tawhid (La ilaha illallah)!. Now what hukm will they be giving to Abdullah ibn Umar, Malik, Shafii, Ahmad, Qadi Iyad, Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Rajab; moreover the majority of the imams of the Islamic ummah? Yes you accusers! Now will you renounce and abandon this attitude? **d- zanaadiqah**

Fourth evidence from the sunnah is the hadith regarding those who Ali (ra) had burnt.

Narrated from Ikrimah: Some zanaadiqah (heretics/atheists) were brought to Ali (ra) and he burnt them. The news of this event, reached Ibn Abbas (ra) who said, "If I had been in his place, I would not have burnt them, as RasulAllah (saw) forbade it, saying, 'Do not punish anybody with Allah's punishment (fire).' I would have killed them according to the statement of RasulAllah (saw), 'Whoever changed his Islamic religion, then kill him'." (Bukhari)

This tribe had claimed Ali to be their deity. When this belief of theirs reached Ali, he burnt them. At this point Ali and Ibn Abbas had made ittifaq that they be killed, although there had been ikhtilaf regarding the method of killing. Nevertheless it had not been mentioned that Ali had excused them for their ignorance and removed their doubts by bringing hujjah. On the contrary instead he had performed the hukm of irtidad to them because they had purely invalidated tawhid. Some might say that in some narrations by saying I am a slave like you, I eat... Ali had brought them hujjah with statements which signify hujjah.

On the contrary as the ulamaa had stated this is an invitation to tawbah. It is not (their enlightenment by) hujjah being established. The evidence for this is for instance Bukhari presenting this narration in the section 'Bab'u Hukm'il Murtad wa'l Murtadda wa Istibatihim' (Dealing with Apostates and inviting them to repentance). Also in Nayl'ul Awtar Sharh'u Muntaka'l Ahbar he had opened the section 'Killing the Musannif Murtad' and had conveyed with this.

Shawkani stated: "The following had been witnessed with the hadith of Ali mentioned in this bab: The zindeeq will be killed without dawah. Also alongside this, in some of the versions of the hadith, it is stated that Amir al mumineen Ali (ra) had invited them to tawbah. Likewise in Fath the riwaya narrated by Abdullah ibn Sharik al AMiri from his father, it is stated: "It was said to Ali: There is a tribe at the door of this masjid, they claim you are their rabb. Ali (ra) called upon them and said: Shame on you! Surely I am only a slave like you. They responded: You are our rabb, our creator and the rizq giver. He replied: shame on you surely I am only a slave like you. I eat as you do. I drink as you do. Hafidh had claimed the sanad of this to be sahih." (Nayl'ul Awtar, 9/57) The expressions of the scholars show that the invite to tawbah is resulting from their irtidad. This does not mean providing hujjah. The reason is they had expelled from deen, of course not with basirah (knowingly). Therefore due to their inclination towards it requesting tawbah from them becomes necessary.

Hafidh ibn al Hajar reports the following from Imam Tahawi: "These individuals had believed that the hukm of the one who makes irtidad from Islam is like the genuine kafir to which dawah had reached. Surely they could be fought prior to an invite to Islam. However surely it is legit to request tawbah from the one who has exited Islam unintentionally. However it had been said that it is not necessary (not proper) to call upon tawbah those who knowingly makes irtidad. Later he narrates that Abu Yusuf had consented to them however stated that if they make tawbah immediately they will be freed and will be relegated to Allah." (Fath'ul Bari, 12/281)

These views of the ulamaa show that the Muslim who leaves Islam due to ignorance is not excused and is a murtad. However it is necessary to request tawbah from his irtidad.

Qadi Iyad stated: "Surely Ali ibn Abu Talib had burned those who claimed his uluhiyyah. Likewise Abdulmalik ibn Marwan had al Haris al Mutanabbi killed and hung. Furthermore many Caliphs and kings had done the same. Fundamentally the scholars of each of their era had agreed upon approval of this action. Also at this point those who oppose them being kafir is also kafir." (Shifa bi Sharh'i Nuraddeen al Kari, 5/472-473) **e-With the agreement of the Muslimeen it is kufr to attribute hulul to a given individual**

Ibn Taymiyyah states: "When it comes to the second type like in the Nasara it is the statement of the individual who defends hulul (to inundate and refers to the false belief that Allah Himself inundates His allies) and ittihad (unity; refers to the belief being discussed i.e. the unity of the Creator and the creation - Allah is exalted above that which they say!). While the Christians claimed this for Isa Masih; the Ghaliya (extreme ghulat) had claimed this for Ali ibn Abi Talib and a group from his ahl bayt... All of these with

the ijma of the entire Muslimeen are kufr in dhahir and batin. Their thoughts and after having 'ilm regarding deenul Islam those who doubt the kufr of individuals as such are also kafir. Just like those who doubt the kufr of the Jews and the Christians and the mushrik are kafir." (Fatawa 2/367-368)

These statements of the salaf which began from the sahabah, are regarding those who who claim deity to a slave. They have become murtad and kafir for invalidating the asl of deen- tawhid. Fundamentally the kufr of such type is known in deenul Islam by necessity. In this sense whoever knows the meaning his statements carry and after knowing deenul Islam hesitates regarding his kufr is personally kafir himself. Just like the one who hesitates regarding the kufr of the Jews, Nasara and the mushrik. **f- The irtidad of those who do not pay Zakah**

Fifth evidence from the sunnah is the hadith regarding those who rejected to pay zakah after the death of RasulAllah (saw).

One of the greatest fitnah which came out during the reign of Abu Bakr (ra) was the tribes which made irtidad by not paying zakah. According to the information provided in books of history regarding this era, a few tribes had rejected paying zakah to Abu Bakr (ra) and for this reason the sahabah had declared merciless war against these tribes. At the end of these wars the tribes who have made irtidad were defeated and declared to be Muslim again after submission to the Muslim army. After irtidad, these tribes called upon the Muslim army with an ideology of 'a war of destruction or rundown peace' when the conditions of the agreement made between these opponents are looked at, we find that the Muslim accept their opponents as murtad and made their opponents accept this also. There is no doubt in the kufr of these tribes which refused to pay zakah. For this reason this issue has been evaluated under the heading 'wars of irtidad'.

Imam Nawawi mentioned al-Khattabi's explanation of the hadith and mentioned that the Murtaddeen who the Sahabah fought against were of different types: two types which apostatized from Islam and some of these went back to the worship of idols and another type of apostate who followed Musaylimah and al-Aswad al-Ansi and believed them in their enmity against the Prophethood. A third type were those who made a distinction between Salah and Zakah and accepted Salah but rejected Zakah and among these were those who did not prevent Zakah to be paid but their leaders did prevent it from being paid. (Sharh Sahih Muslim)

In this era there had been tribes which refused to pay zakah to Abu Bakr although they performed the necessities of deen; due to a fasid ta'weel they claimed zakah had been an application genuine to RasulAllah. The hukm regarding these individuals had been given regardless of their ignorance and their fasid ta'weel and they had been reckoned as murtad. Although most of the sahabah had not given these second group tribes which we could evaluate in furuuddeen with the hukm of kufr at first, they had all made ittifak on giving the hukm of kufr to these individuals after Abu Bakr had spoken to the tribes regarding the matter. Those who did not pay zakah with a fasid ta'weel had relied on the following ayah and did not pay zakah: "Of

their goods, take alms, that so thou mightest purify and sanctify them; and pray on their behalf. Verily thy prayers are a source of security for them: And Allah is One Who heareth and knoweth.” (At-Tawba 9; 103) They would say: “This is addressed directly to RasulAllah (saw). The hukm is invalid with his death. In reality no one is capable to purify and sanctify but he.” In spite of their ignorant and fasid ta'weel, Abu Bakr (ra) fought against them. He fought against them as if he was in war with the one who claimed to be an envoy and those who subjected to him; moreover a war which children are taken as slaves, the properties of the murtad are reckoned as spoils and making shahadah that their dead are in jahannam.

Again in the same era there had been some who did not reject to pay zakah, however because they had feared the detriment of the tribes they belonged to, they had not sent their zakah; these individuals had not been reckoned as murtad. For example; the tribe of Banu Yarbu had collected zakah amongst them and just when they were sending it to Abu Bakr, Malik b. Nuwayra had heard about this, he confiscated the zakah and scattered the tribe. When mentioning these individuals, the scholars had informed us that they had not been murtad. Some individuals with the mentality of the munafiq and zindeeq take the statement of these scholars and use it as evidence for themselves that those who did not pay zakah had not been given the hukm murtad or they try to make it seem as if there had been ihtilaf among the scholars regarding the matter. They bring such baatil ideologies to their agenda to defend their claim that the mushrik society of today cannot be made takfir of.

These statements come across as a sign of nifaq in the hearts, due to the ignorance that individuals are upon and the corrupt mentalities in the minds. All praise to Allah who openly shows evidence. With these assertions these individuals defend that in asluddeen the scholars did not agree they had ihtilaf and from this point of view they claim jahl -ignorance- can be an excuse in asluddeen and that even the common mass (regardless of their actions of kufr and shirk) could not be made takfir of. The individual who denies anything contained in Asluddeen without looking at his ignorance and ta'weel he will be given the hukm kafir. The one who has doubts regarding the kufr of these individuals will also be given the same hukm. The mushrik societies of today do not recognize shirk, do not avoid shirk, do not make bara'a (keep distant) from those of ahl shirk and by doing this, it means they may have in chain reaction performed hundreds of shirk and kufr. At the same time they have not made oneness of Allah as they should, they have performed acts of shirk in the asma wa sifat (the beautiful names of Allah and His unique attributes) the uluhiyyah and rububiyyah of Allah and have never been Muslim in any part of their lives. Those who give the hukm of Muslim to these individuals by looking at the signs which had been considered the signs of Islam only in the first era of Islam (such as the islamic clothing etc) will only be testifying to their own kufr.

It has been accepted as kufr and irtidad by the ulamaa to debate over any fard of Islam which had been accepted with ijma or again making halaal of anything which has been established with

ijma to be haraam. “Those who deny a hadith which carries the conditions of being sahih will have fallen out of the fold of Islam, made irtidad and will resurrect on the Day of Judgment with either the Jews or the Christians whichever group of kufr they want to comply with. (Miftahu’l jannah fi’l-ihitijaji bi’s Sunnah, 5) Again with the same sense Muhammad b. AbdulWahhab as an answer to those who claimed he was a takfiri said: “Those who deny eating with the right hand, those who deny the Sunnah of fajr and witr become kafir but those who deny all Islam and who declare Islam to be untrue and makes a mockery of those who apply themselves to Islam are accounted to be your brothers as long as they say ‘lailaha illa Allah’! (Siyar ul Muhtasar) Abu Batin narrated the following from Ibn Taymiyyah: “The individual who rejects ibadah to Allah ta’ala, keeping distant from all claimed partners, to be distant from and have enmity to the Jews, Christians, and the mushrikoon, issues openly known to be haraam in Islam such as fornication, alcohol, gambling, will be made takfir on. (Meaning jahl -ignorance- and ta’weel is not an excuse in these matters)” (ad-Duraru’s- Saniyya 10/372-373)

The situation of those who do not deny the hukm of zakah, however with the fasid ta’weel, have developed rejection of giving zakah to Abu Bakr (ra) will be evaluated in the extent of furuuddeen. Different ijtihaad have been allowed in situations which belong in furuuddeen. Just like the difference in ijtihaad regarding the one who abandon salah the ulamaa carried, regarding the abandonment of zakah there has been difference in ijtihaad among the sahabah as well as among the scholars after them. One of the greatest faults of those who try to water down tawhid today is to take in hand matters of furuuddeen which scholars had had ikhtilaf over and compare it with matters of asluddeen and with it defend that the mushrik societies today cannot be made takfir upon. May Allah give them hidayah!

1- The hukm of those who do not give zakah

The hukm of the salaf regarding them is also the same as the hukm above (i.e murtad) and the hadith regarding them is reported in the sahihayn and other sources of hadith.

In the muhaddith jamaa'ah sources other than Ibn Majah the following is stated: It is narrated on the authority of Abu Hurayrah that “When RasulAllah (saw) breathed his last and Abu Bakr was appointed as his successor (Caliph), those amongst the Arabs who wanted to become apostates became apostates. 'Umar b. Khattab said to Abu Bakr: Why would you fight against the people, when RasulAllah (saw) declared: I have been directed to fight against people so long as they do not say: There is no god but Allah, and he who professed it was granted full protection of his property and life on my behalf except for a right? His (other) affairs rest with Allah. Upon this Abu Bakr said: By Allah, I would definitely fight against him who severed prayer from Zakat, for it is the obligation upon the rich. By Allah, I would fight against them even to secure the cord (used for hobbling the feet of a camel) which they used to give to RasulAllah (as zakat) but now they have withheld it. Umar b. Khattab remarked: By Allah, I found nothing but the fact that Allah had opened the heart of Abu Bakr for (perceiving the justification of) fighting (against those who refused to pay Zakat) and I fully recognized that the (stand of Abu Bakr) was right.”

(Ibnu'l Jawzi, Muntazam 4/76; Bukhari; Muslim; Abu Dawud 1556; Nasai, Mujtaba 5/14, 15; Tirmidhi 2733; Balazuri, Futuhu'l Buldan 1/113; Ahmad, Musnad; Bayhaqi, S. Kubra; Hakim 2/522; Abdurrazzak no 6916, 10020, 18718; Hatib 9/315, 10/464, 12/201; Bukhari Tarihk Kabir 3/367, 7/35; Ibnu Abi Shayba 10/122, 123, 12/374, 376, 377, 380; Tabarani Kabir 2/198, 347, 6/161, 8/382; Said b. Mansur sunnan 2901, 2933 etc)

Ibn Kathir in his Tarikh stated: "Some Arab delegates began to come to Madinah. They accept the performance of salah but they are not willing to pay zakah. Although some of them accept to pay zakah they did not want to give it to Abu Bakr. Furthermore some of them from those who did not want to give it to Abu Bakr presented the following ayah as evidence: "Of their goods, take alms, that so thou mightest purify and sanctify them; and pray on their behalf. Verily thy prayers are a source of security for them: And Allah is One Who heareth and knoweth" (At-Tawba 9; 103) and stated "we will only pay zakah to the one whose dua is trust for us."

Some among them uttered this poem:

"We obeyed RasulAllah as long as he was amongst us.

Yet what is the hakimiyyah of Abu Bakr?

We are bewildered."

...Hafidh b. Asakir narrated Salih b. Kaysan said: "After the situation of irtidat occurred, Abu Bakr stood up among people and after making hamd to Allah said: "Indeed the Arabs among you do not want to give their sheep and camel as zakah. Even if they return to deen, while they had not been in deen before the Prophet had never had any need for them and you as Muslims have never been so strong. This is because of the blessing of your Prophet (saw) from before... He (Abu Bakr) called the Madinans for a meeting at Masjid Nabawi. At the commencement of the meeting he did the following speech: "Indeed the dunya is kafir. The delegates on the face of the earth have seen you are little in number. You do not know if they will come upon you during the night or the day. The closest ones to you are in a distance of one barid. They hope that we accept their salah and the fact that they will not be giving zakah but we did not accept this proposal. Do the needed preparation for them. They may attack you." ... The tribes of Bani Zubyan and Bani Abs attacked the Muslim who lived among them and killed them. The rest of the tribes did the same thing. Upon this Abu Bakr had made an oath to kill an equal amount or more from the tribes which had killed the Muslim. (Ibn Kathir, Al Bidaya Wa'n-Nihaya, VI)

Narrating from Tabari and Ibn Jawzi, Dhahabi stated: "Urwa and the rest narrated: Abu bakr (ra) had set off with an army constituting from the muhajiruun and the ansar. He came to a place called Nak aligned with Najd. The badawi took their children and ran away. Abu Bakr made a consultation with those with him. They told him to return to Madina to be with the children and women and to appoint someone else to lead the army. He appointed Khaled b. Waled and returned. Before leaving he told Khalid to allow those from among the murtad who returns to Islam and pays zakah to return to Madinah. And he was sent off. (Tabari relates a narration similar from Ibn Hisham Kalabi 2/160, Ibn Jawzi Muntazam 4/76) (Tarikh ul Islam Wafayat ul Mashahiri wa'l alam, Dhahabi, V)

"The Hawazin informed that they would not be paying their zakah. When news of irtidad spread from all over to Abu Bakr (ra) he tried to revert them back to Islam by sending representatives and waited for the return of the army of Usaamah. However he was forced to take action to destroy the dangers caused by the attack of the Abs and Zubyan tribes. Meanwhile other representatives from some tribes came to Madinah and notified them that they would perform salah but would not pay zakah. They wanted this situation to be accepted. Abu Bakr gave the following sharp answer to the ambassadors: "Until you give me ropes to tie up the animals as your payment of zakah I will fight with you"" (Tabari, 3/244)

In the Tarikh of Ibn'ul Ather the following has been recorded: "A war occurred between the Muslim from among the Bani Tamim and those who became murtad by not paying zakah." (Ibn Atheer, Tarikh)

Ibn Hazm narrates the attitude of the sahabah and the opinion of Abu Bakr: "... some stated" I will perform salah; but I will not pay zakah." Most of the sahabah were saying they accepted them to be Muslim and that there should be no need to fight with them. Abu Bakr did not assimilate to this thought. He sent the army of Usamah b. Zayd. This army went up to the border of Syria. They arranged an unexpected attack on the Kudaa tribe and returned. In another hadith the heavy conditions brought at the end of the war had been mentioned: "After victory Abu Bakr (ra) said the following to the murtad: "Choose! A destructive war or peace in vulgarity" they answered: "We saw the destructive war. What is peace in vulgarity? Abu Bakr answered: "You will pay diyah for our dead. We will not pay diyah for your dead. You will make shahada that our dead will go to jannah and yours to jahannam. You will return what you had taken from us. We will not return what we took from you. All your weaponry will be taken from you, you will be restricted from riding horses and until the hukm of the amr al mumineen and the Muslimineen changes, you will live among the Muslim in vulgarity." They answered: "We accept this o ye the caliph of RasulAllah!" 'Umar b Khatab said: "O caliph of RasulAllah! I accept everything you say. However I do not accept diyah for our dead. Because those who died from among us died on the path Allah they are martyrs and their reward belongs to Allah." All the sahabah accepted the view of 'Umar." (Bayhaqi, al-Barkani narrated according to the conditions of Bukhari.)

shaikh Abdullah b. As-Shaykh Muhammad b. AbdulWahhab narrated the following from Ibn Taymiyyah: "At the end of his article regarding the kufr of those who did not pay zakah Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) stated: 'The sahabah did not ask them if they believed it was fard or if they did not believe so. An approach as such has never been narrated by the sahabah. On the contrary As Siddiq (ra) said to 'Umar: "Wallahi if they withhold a goat they used to give RasulAllah, I will fight them for this reason. As seen Abu Bakr (ra) he did not give the non belief of zakah as a reason of war, he gave it for not giving it. Likewise it had been narrated that a group from among them did believe it was fard to pay zakah however avoided giving zakah. In spite of this the attitude of the Caliph towards them had always been the same. This attitude had been that their warriors are killed, the families are taken as slaves, and their estates are confiscated as spoils also the shahadah that their dead will go to jahannam. Furthermore he had characterized all of them as ahl riddah. Thus the greatest virtue of Siddiq (ra) beside them had been the fact that Allah had made him determined to fight the murtad. He had not hesitated like others, on the contrary he argued with them and made them accept his view.

When it comes to those who believed in the Nubuwwa of Musaylimah:

Among the sahabah there had been no argument regarding the matter of fighting against them. This is the hujjah to those who say this: If they go to war with the imam to not give, they will become kafir, otherwise they will not be. The reason for this is without doubt other than those who do not fight with the imam, with ittifak supported by the nass in book and sunnah of the sahabah their inclusion in kufr and ahl riddah has been fixed.

This statement and explanation must be thought over: It is fought with the group who rejected to pay zakah to the imam. They are given the hukm of kufr and irtidad (murtad). Their families are taken as slaves and their properties are accounted as spoils. If they are to believe zakah is fard, perform salah 5 times a day and even if they perform all of the necessities of Islam this does not lift the hukm given to them as kafir and murtad and does not lift the need to fight against them. This matter is fixed with the Qur'an, sunnah and the ittifaq of the sahabah. Allahu Alim'." (Al Kalimat'un Nafia fi'l Mukaffirat'il Wakia, 17; The 10th risala of Akida al Muwahhidin)

Imam Ibn Taymiyyah also explains this in his Fatawa, "The commentary to this is that the sahabah have unanimously accepted and the Imams after them to fight the people who stopped paying the Zakah, even if they pray five times and fast the month of Ramadan. Those kinds of people had no acceptable explanation for their actions. This is why they were called apostates and fought, because they stopped paying the Zakah even if they admit that they should pay the Zakah as Allah ordered." (Majmu Fataawa 28/518) and Ibn Taymiyyah continues: "Without doubt the sahabah and the imams after them had made ittifak regarding going to war with them; even if they performed salah and fasted in Ramadan. These have not been valid doubts for the sahabah regarding this matter. The sahabah had fought them as Allah had commanded because they did not give; even if they had stated it was fard." (Ibn Taymiyyah, Fatawa 28/ 519; Muhammad Bin AbdulWahhab, Siyar ul Muhtasar) **2- The foundation of the fiqh of Abu Bakr giving the hukm of irtidad and declaring war**

"The evidence of Abu Bakr deciding to go to war with those who did not give zakah is the following application of RasulAllah (saw). RasulAllah had sent someone to collect zakah from an individual of the tribe of Ashja'. When he did not give zakah he sent him again for the second time, by the third time he told him to behead him if he does not give zakah." (Zaynudeen Ahmad Zabidi, Sahih Bukhari Muhtasar Tajrid Sarih V 21) According to a narration by Bahz bin Hakim, and him from his father and him from his grandfather: RasulAllah (saw) said "For every forty camels there is in the pasture, there is a female camel at the age of three for zakah. The camels weak or strong will not differ. Whoever gives zakah hoping for ajr." Ibn Ala stated: (If he requested ajr he will be rewarded.) Whoever does not give zakah we will take the zakah and along with it half his property. We will take this as a command among the commands from our Rabb Azza wa Jalla, there is nothing for the family of Muhammad." (Abu Dawud, Nasai, Ahmad bin Hanbal, Hakim)

On the other hand there is ijma regarding going to war with those who do not perform salah. Here Abu

Bakr has made qiyas to salah. "Maziri states "As understood in the dhahir of the hadith 'Umar had consented to go to war with those who denied salah. Abu Bakr (ra) convinced him he must do the same-go to war 'for zakah'. The reason was because both of them had been commanded in the Book and Sunnah together and were not evaluated separately." (Sharh Kuttubi Sitta)

Abu Bakr had believed that zakah had been the right of goods and Islam and had informed that until this right was given they would fight.

"Upon this Abu Bakr said: By Allah, I would definitely fight against him who severed prayer from Zakat, for it is the obligation upon the rich. By Allah, I would fight against them even to secure the cord (used for hobbling the feet of a camel) which they used to give to the RasulAllah (saw) (as zakat) but now they have withheld it." (sources mentioned above) "But when the forbidden months are passed, then fight and slay the Pagans wherever ye find them, and seize them, beleaguer them, and lie in wait for them in every stratagem (of war); but if they repent, and establish regular prayers and practise regular charity, then open the way for them: for Allah is Oft-forgiving, Most Merciful." (Tawba 5); "And in their wealth and possessions (was remembered) the right of the (needy,) him who asked, and him who (for some reason) was prevented (from asking). " (adh-Dhariyat 9) "Eat ye of the fruit thereof when it fruiteth, and pay the due thereof upon the harvest day, " (al-Anam 141) Ibn 'Umar narrated: RasulAllah (saw) said: "I have been ordered (by Allah) to fight against the people until they testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that Muhammad is Allah's Apostle, and offer the prayers perfectly and give the obligatory charity, so if they perform that, then they save their lives and property from me except for Islamic laws and then their reckoning (accounts) will be done by Allah." (Bukhari & Muslim)

"Narrated Ibn 'Umar: RasulAllah (saw) said: Islam is based on (the following) five (principles): 1. To testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and Muhammad is Allah's Apostle. 2. To offer the (compulsory congregational) prayers dutifully and perfectly. 3. To pay Zakat (i.e. obligatory charity). 4. To perform Hajj. (i.e. Pilgrimage to Mecca) 5. To observe fast during the month of Ramadan." (Bukhari & Muslim)

Again those who did not give zakah had been evaluated as kuffar in other hadith. "Ibn Abbas, (ra), said, "Whoever has enough property to make pilgrimage or to pay Zakat but he does not will ask Allah to return (to this world) when dying." Someone said, "Ibn 'Abbas, fear Allah, No one asks for return but the unbelievers." Then Ibn 'Abbas read Allah's saying, {And spend something (in charity) out of the substance which We have bestowed on you, before death should come to any of you and he should say, ' O my Lord! Why didst thou not give me respite for a little while I should then have given (largely) in charity, and I should have been one of the doers of good." (Al-Munafiqun: 10) (Imam Shamsu ed-Deen Dhahabi, Al-Kabair) **3- The hukm regarding the zakah rejecters**

According to the Hanafi, Maliki and Shaafi the Muslim who do not deny the fact that zakah is fard but denies paying zakah, zakah will be forcefully taken. If needed a war will be declared and fought against them. (Ash-Sharhu's Saghir 1/ 239; 679; Kifayau'l taub 2/252; Al-Majmuu 5/356)

According to one view of the Hanbali those who do not pay zakah but do not deny it is fard, will be kafir. According to another view those who do not deny zakah and do not pay zakah will not be kafir. However along with zakah half his goods will be forcefully taken. (Al Mu'ni 2/427-428)

Qadi Iyad sums up the opinions: “These – Allah give us and you tawfiq – are the foundations of Islam, which make a kafir of any man who consciously rejects one of them and make his blood halaal and put him outside the main body of Muslims.

But as for somebody who leaves them aside out of carelessness or taking them lightly even though he admits they are obligatory:

As for Zakat: It is taken from him by force if he refuses to give it. If he tries to stop it, he will be overpowered and forced to do it. If he has forces, he will be fought against until either he gives it or it is taken from him. The Muslims are required to make war against him with the Leader.

Some of the ‘ulamaa have held the position that whoever leaves out anything of these foundations – even if he admits to them being obligatory – is a kafir and is killed. Like the man who does not make the salat.

But they do not disagree about the kufr of the man who consciously rejects that they are obligatory. And they do not disagree about killing him.” (Qadi ‘Iyad, the Foundations of Islam)

In conclusion “A war will be fought with those who do not give zakah. However, without providing evidence to those who reject the payment of zakah relying on ta'weel as mentioned above they will not be given the kufr hukm. After the sahabah defeated them they had ikhtilaf regarding the matter of making their offspring slaves and their properties ganimah. Should they be treated as kafir or rebellions? Abu Bakr (ra) had treated them as kuffar and acted as such. ‘Umar (ra) had ikhtilaf with Abu Bakr regarding this matter. He had assimilated the second view, during his reign others had also accepted this view and ijma had come into existence regarding the acceptance of those who deny one of the fard of Islam as rebellious and not treated as kafir. Such that this individual will be requested to revoke this denial, if he resists and tries to kill he will be fought with, hujjah will be presented. In this case if he reverts he reverts, if not he will be treated as a kafir. (Sharh Kuttubi Sitta)

Regarding this group who did not give zakah with a fasid ta'weel, although they embraced Kalimat shahadah, performed salah and the rest of the fara'idh, the sahabah relying on Qur'an and Sunnah had ittifak that these individuals would be battled with, they had become murtad, their properties were spoils, their families were made slaves and that their dead had gone to jahannam.

g- The application of kufr in the matters of furuuddeen

This is what had happened in a part of sharee'ah. A state of ignorance, fasid ta'weel and an invalid doubt caused people to fall in this state. All of this had not rid the hukm of kufr from them. For this reason they had been accepted murtad. All of this happens in the frame of furuad (the secondary matters) of sharee'ah. Now what is our dhann regarding the subject of tawhid which is the essence of asluddeen??

It is evident that without the truth of tawhid neither in this world nor in the hereafter there is no salvation for anyone. Likewise the treaty had been taken in this context and servants (human beings) have been created in that fitrah. Nevertheless the envoys had been sent with that aim and the books had been revealed with it. Likewise as in the akhirah this will be asked, and for this reason swords have been swung for the sake of His Almightyness.

Evidence such as Qur'an, Nabawi hadith, the sahabah and the salafus saliheen, subsequent to them it should be sufficient enough to refute the principle that ignorance is not an excuse for those from among this ummah who made irtidad after Islam and have mixed great shirk in their lives. In reality some late individuals have made some establishments regarding this regulation (that ignorance is not an excuse). In this context the regulation under consideration is unfamiliar to sharee'ah. These individuals have extended the borders of this regulation so much that people have submitted to the taghout, their helpers, the zindeeq, mulhid and the secularists. Their aim is to ruin aqidah, to destroy Islam and to have victory of the war of shirk against Islam. After all of this, they ask us to give hukm of Islam to the taghout and its associates. They have the desire to take on as comrades with tolerance and to those who oppose, they desire to show enmity. What would be said in this condition: Inna lillahi wa inna ilayhi raji'oon.

We say the following:

“And Allah hath full power and control over his affairs; but most among mankind know it not. (Yusuf 12; 21)

Without doubt in the frame of the understanding of the sahabah and the imams after them, these evidences gives the hukm kufr to those who do shirk and especially those who closely decrease tawhid. Certainly whoever is to embrace Tawhid and ends with shirk, likewise who embraces Islam and in this situation falls in a situation that necessitates kufr, and if his ta'weel is fasid and if his doubt is not valid this individual will not be excused for the reason of ignorance. The evidences for this are the hadith regarding the Khawaarij, the first era of Qadariyyah and those who did not pay zakah. Our say on the murtad and irtidad is as such. The masses today have not cleansed themselves from shirk and have not become hanif nor have they become muwahhid who makes complete tawhid to Allah. Consequently as these individuals will not be counted from this ummah it would not be correct to call them Muslim and again murtad when they perform kufr. These masses are mushrik asli, and have never entered into the

fold of Islam.

Without doubt Allah (awj) knows best.

Allah (swt), says,

“Now have come to you, from your Lord proofs (to open your eyes): If any will see, it will be for (the good of) his own soul: If any will be blind it will be to his own (harm) I am not (here to watch over your doing.)” (al-An' am, 104) **3-The matter of Irtidad in sources from the Salaf**

a- Irtidad

In the section opened under the title “A fasl regarding statements which are kufr, are paused in regards to and are made ikhtilaf over and the bayan of those which are not kufr” the Maliki imam Qadi Iyad states: “Surely the tahqiq of this section and getting rid of the confusion within is based on sharee'ah. Within this aql will not be included. The building block of this matter is this: Surely the invalidation of rububiyyah and wahdaniyyah and ibadah to another than Allah or another along with Allah is definitely kufr... Like this alongside accepting Allah as deity and His oneness, with the ijma of the Muslimeen whoever claims He is not alive and not eternal or that He is created or conceived (concept) or that He has a child or spouse or He is a father or that he had been born from something or that there is other things along with him in eternity or for the universe there is a maker or mudabbir other than Him; is kafir. Likewise whoever claims like some sufists and some among the batini, Nasara and Karamita that he sat with Allah or that he ascended to Him or that he spoke to Him or that He made hulul to an individual, all these are kufr. Again we will give the hukm kufr to those who state this: the Universe is eternal, it will remain everlasting or if he is in doubt regarding these... Similarly whoever claims regarding our Prophet that when he made dawah and informed that he got involved with lying or doubts his truthfulness or curses him or claims he did not make tabligh or if he belittles him (saw) or one of the nabi, if he condemns them or oppresses them or kills a prophet and makes war with him, those who carry this belief and attitude are with ijma kafir. Similarly if he rejects the nass of the book or who allots that which there is certain ijma regarding its narration, also that which ijma had been made to impute to its dhahir for example like the Khawaarij being made takfir of with the nullification of rajm. There had been ijma regarding the takfir of these (who make the above claims). For this reason whoever does not make takfir of the one who selects another deen other than the deen of the muslimeen and has begun to live with it, or if he pauses at this (making takfir of such individual) or doubts it, likewise if he remarks their views may be correct in this situation even if he shows Islam outwardly and believes in it and even if he accepts all the views (madhabs) other than it (Islam) is baatil, we will make takfir of such individual. He is kafir for the reason that he has exhibited the opposite of what he showed in the dhahir. Likewise we will make takfir of every action which the Muslimeen made ijma of that it only will appear from a kafir; even if its doer with this crooked action claims to be Muslim. For example his sajda to idols, the sun, the moon, the cross, fire and running to churches, trading with its ahl, like wearing the zunnar, wearing their clothing and bowing his head like them, surely the Muslimeen had agreed that these can only appear from the kuffar and even if the doer claims his Islam/ to be Muslim they (the

muslimeen) had informed these actions to be the signs of kufr. Likewise the Muslimeen had made ijma in the kufr of the individual who after having knowledge of that which Allah made haraam killing, consuming alcohol, fornication if he considers these halaal. For example like the Ibahi from the Karamati and some extreme sufis. (Kitab'u Shifa bi Sharh'i Nuraddeen al Kari, 5/401-431)

Among the Shafii ulamaa, Ibn Naqib provides the following list of acts that entailed leaving Islam:

to prostrate to an idol, whether sarcastically, out of mere contrariness, or in actual conviction, like that of someone who believes the Creator to be something that has originated in time. Like idols in this respect are the sun or moon, and like prostration is bowing to other than Allah, if one intends reverence towards it like the reverence due to Allah;

to intend to commit unbelief, even if in the future. And like this intention is hesitating whether to do so or not: one thereby immediately commits unbelief;

to speak words that imply unbelief such as "Allah is the third of three," or "I am Allah — unless one's tongue has run away with one, or one is quoting another, or is one of the friends of Allah (awj) in a spiritually intoxicated state of total oblivion (A: friend of Allah or not, someone totally oblivious is as if insane, and is not held legally responsible, for these latter do not entail unbelief;

to revile Allah or His messenger (saw);

to deny the existence of Allah, His beginning-less eternalness, His endless eternalness, or to deny any of His attributes which the consensus of Muslims ascribes to Him;

to be sarcastic about Allah's name, His command, His interdiction, His promise, or His threat;

to deny any verse of the Qur'an or anything which by ijma (scholarly consensus) belongs to it, or to add a verse that does not belong to it;

to mockingly say, "I don't know what faith is";

to reply to someone who says, "There is no power or strength save through Allah": "Your saying 'There's no power or strength, etc.' won't save you from hunger";

for a tyrant, after an oppressed person says, "This is through the decree of Allah," to reply, "I act without the decree of Allah";

to say that a Muslim is a kafir in words that are uninterpretable as merely meaning he is an ingrate towards Allah for divinely given blessings;

when someone asks to be taught the Shahada 'La-ilaha illallah Muhammadun rasulAllah", and a Muslim

refuses to teach him it;

to describe a Muslim or someone who wants to become a Muslim in terms of kufr;

to deny the obligatory character of something which by the consensus of Muslims is part of Islam, when it is well known as such, like the prayer (salat) or even one raka'ah from one of the five obligatory prayers, if there is no excuse;

to hold that any of Allah's messengers or prophets are liars, or to deny their being sent; (Umdat al-salik)

Alaad-din Abidin adds the following:

to revile the religion of Islam;

to believe that things in themselves or by their own nature have any causal influence independent of the will of Allah;

to deny the existence of angels or jinn, or the heavens;

to be sarcastic about any ruling of the Sacred Law;

or to deny that Allah intended the message of RasulAllah (saw) to be the religion followed by the entire world. (al-Hadiyya al-Ala'iyya, 423-24) **b- Shirk can not be present along with Islam**

As seen when Qadi Iyad mentions above 'great shirk (Shirk'ul akbar)' he performs the hukm kufr and Irtidad to the doer of great shirk; even if the doer unveils his Islam, and claims to be Muslim. Moreover he does not even mention the restriction (haraam) of the matter in question. Whereas when he mentions the one who accounts killing, fornication and alcoholic drinks to be halaal, he bases this on the doer having knowledge of its hukm. The reason is because first of all he nullifies tawhid and the aqidah of tawhid. Whereas the regulation in Islam belonging to the Muslim is performed (he is considered Muslim) with the supposition that he has the Islamic i'tiqaad and that he is abstract from shirk. When it is acknowledged that he is not cleansed from shirk or that he has returned to it, the necessity of fighting him will be in question and once more the protection of his life and property will be lifted. For this reason this is opposite of the situations in furuudeen. The reason is because they will not be included in Islam and therefore the Islamic jurisdiction will only prevail by his utterance of tawhid and not by his utterance of being Muslim. According to this, tawhid is the base of deen. No one will benefit from any type obedience if he abandons tawhid, even if he submits to Islam by obedience, this will not be accepted. Furthermore this act is barren and useless. Whereas the one who comes (submits) with tawhid, all sins outside of tawhid will be forgiven inshaAllah. In the ayah of Allah the following is stated:

"Allah forgiveth not that partners should be set up with Him; but He forgiveth anything else, to whom He pleaseth." (an-Nisa 4/48)

“Allah forgiveth not (The sin of) joining other gods with Him; but He forgiveth whom He pleaseth other sins than this.” (an-Nisa 4/116)

“But it has already been revealed to thee,- as it was to those before thee,- ‘If thou wert to join (gods with Allah), truly fruitless will be thy work (in life), and thou wilt surely be in the ranks of those who lose (all spiritual good)’.” (az-Zumar 39/65)

“And whosoever of you turns back from his religion and dies as a disbeliever, then his deeds will be lost in this life and in the Hereafter, and they will be the dwellers of the Fire. They will abide therein forever.” (al-Baqarah 2/217)

Therefore it had been narrated the Muslimeen had made ijma over the fact that ibadaah to other than Allah can only be present in a kafir. Meaning it can only appear from a kafir even if its doer claims to be Muslim along with performing great shirk which is an act of kufr. As seen these are the most general of the statements that declare generality. Because this is the style of hasr and kasr. Meaning ibadaah to any other but Allah can only be performed by a kafir. This can never be present along with Islam. This is the opposite of seeing some that is haraam to be halaal. The doer of such act can be Muslim. For example he could be living in a distant desert. Or he may have not become Muslim yet. Or maybe in his era this matter had not been a haraam necessarily known in deen. In all these situations he is excused for his ignorance because the information regarding the hukm of sharee'ah had not reached him. As long as this individual is ignorant of the hukm in furuu', he will not be made takfir of. Regarding tawhid, the situation is the opposite. It is kufr to invalidate tawhid before or after the hukm of sharee'ah had been announced. **1-The Description of Irtidad and its types**

The Arabic equivalent for apostasy is riddah or irtidad from the root radd which among other connotations has the meaning to retreat, to retire, to withdraw from or fall back from. In the context of Muslim fiqh, it is equated with renunciation or abandonment of Islam by one who professes the Islamic faith. The apostate is called murtad. According to the Muslim jurists apostasy may be committed with reference to belief, word or deed or even by failure to observe certain obligatory practices. The person concerned must have attained maturity, should be in full possession of his senses and should have acted voluntarily, if he is to be condemned as an apostate.

The matters which constitute irtidad are mainly divided into four categories:

(a) Irtidad in beliefs, such as associating others with Allah, denying Him, or denying an attribute which is proven to be one of His attributes, or by affirming that Allah has a son. Whoever believes this is murtad and a disbeliever.

(b) Irtidad in words, such as insulting Allah or RasulAllah (saw).

(c) Irtidad in actions, such as throwing the Qur'an into a filthy place, because doing that shows

disrespect towards the words of Allah (awj), so it is a sign that one does not believe. Other such actions include prostrating to an idol or to the sun or moon.

(d) Irtidad by omission, such as not doing any of the rituals of Islam, or turning away from following it altogether.

The author of Kifayat'ul Ahyar, AbuBakr ibn Muhammad states in dictionarial terms riddah means converting from one thing to another. And continues to state: "It is as such in this ayah "Enter the holy land which Allah hath assigned unto you, and turn not back." (al-Maida 5/21) In the sharee'ah it is converting to kufr from Islam and ceasing Islam. Sometimes this will happen by word, sometimes by action and sometimes by i'tiqaad. In all three of these types there are different issues. It is a bit difficult to summarize but we will mention it with essence information:

Irtidad by word: Just like someone saying this to his enemy: If I had a rabb I would not worship him. Surely the individual who says this will be kafir. Likewise if there was a prophet I would not make iman to him or for his child or spouse (if he says) he/she is much dear to me than Allah or His rasul. For instance after an ill person gets better if he is to say: In this illness I have faced such distress that if I had killed Abu Bakr and umar I still would not have deserved such thing. He will be kafir with this. Some scholars had said he must be killed immediately because his words would mean attributing injustice to Allah...

In the same sense even if he does not claim to be a prophet yet claims he was sent revelations or that he entered jannah, ate from its fruits and was in close embrace with the huri, this surely with ijma is kufr. With these and other similar words, some zindeeq sufis utter if they are to revile one of the prophets or belittle one of them he will with ijma be made takfir of. May Allah kill them! How ignorant they are and how kafir they are, yes how they deceive those who believe them.

Kufr (Irtidad) by action: Like performing sajdah to an idol, the sun and the moon; throwing the mushaf (Qur'an) in dirt and the magic that contains ibadaah to the sun, likewise slaughtering sacrifices for idols, disgraceful action with one of the names of Allah or His commands and His intimidation and reciting the Qur'an while accompanying with the tambourine.

If he performs an action the Muslimeen had made ijma regarding it can only be performed by a kafir, even while he makes sajdah to the cross or goes to churches with its members wearing their zunnar and other clothing, if he proclaims his Islam, all of these are kufr and the doer will be made takfir of.

Kufr (Irtidad) by i'tiqaad: The examples for this are truly plenty. For example whoever believes the universe is eternal or that the creator came later or believes negatively about something which ijma has been made over that is stable regarding Allah or regarding something which ijma had been made over that can't be existent regarding Him for example colors, juncture and separation, he will be kafir.

Compliance of kufr is kufr: The intention of kufr is kufr at that instant. If an individual hesitates to

become kafir or not to become kafir he will become kafir that instant. Likewise postponing kufr which will happen in the future is also kufr at that instant.

After these are known the individual whose Irtidad has been stabilized, is a murtad individual whose blood will be wasted. The reason is because he has demonstrated the most evil type of kufr and hukmwise the most obscene. It is stated in the ayah:

“O ye who believe! if any from among you turn back from his Faith...” (al-Maida 5/54)

“...Evil indeed are (the works) which their souls have sent forward before them (with the result), that Allah's wrath is on them, and in torment will they abide.” (al-Maida 5/80)

Here there are two views regarding if it is recommended (mustahab) to call him to tawbah or if it is waajib. According to one view it is mustahab. In a hadith RasulAllah (saw) stated: “Whoever changes his religion, execute him.” (Bukhari, Kitaab Istataabat ul-Murtaddeen wa'l-Mu'aaniddeen wa Qitaalahum (Dealing with the Apostates and Those who Stubbornly Hate Islam and Confronting Them); Imam Shafii in al-Umm under the title 'al-Murtaddeen 'an il-Islam' (Those who Apostate from Islam), 1/257; al-Humaydi, Musnad; Abu Dawud, Kitaab ul-Hudood, 'the ruling of those who apostatize'; Nasai, 'on the ruling of the apostate, # 4059; Tirmidhi, 'What has Arrived Regarding the Murtad'). The correct thing is that it is necessary for certain... It is because Irtidad usually is sourced from an occurring doubt. Therefore it is not permissible to kill prior to removing this doubt. Requesting tawbah from them is like the condition of ahl harb. Surely we will only kill them after dawah has reached them and the miracle has become dhahir." (Kifayat'ul-Ahyar, Bab'ur-riddah, 2/123)

c- Most of Irtidad is sourced from ignorance and confusion

These words should be looked at carefully. He states if a person performs an action which by ijma it is accepted that such action can only occur by a kafir, along with this action even if he claims to be Muslim... regarding an individual as such what ever had been said before is still valid. Likewise the statement it is necessary to invite the murtad to tawbah also carries the same meaning. The Author relies his reading on the fact that general Irtidad relies on doubt. This is what Imam Tahawi had said: Surely requesting tawbah is legitimate for everyone who has left Islam other than those who did it with basirah (knowingly).

Ibn Qudamah stipulates the necessity of requesting tawbah and states: “The reason is Irtidad is usually sourced from pester of a doubt. When he is enlightened and his doubt is rid he will return to Islam. However killing prior to the request of tawbah does not necessitate compensation because his protection of life has been annihilated with his Irtidad. (Al-Kafi, Bab'ul-Murtad)

Ibn Qudamah also said: “Murtad should not be put to death until he has been asked to repent three times. This is the view of the majority of scholars, including Umar (ra), Ali (ra), Ata, al-Nakhai, Malik, al-Thawri, al-Awzai, Ishaq and others. Because irtidad comes about because of doubt, and cannot be

dispelled in an instant. Time should be allowed for the person to rethink the matter, and the best length of time is three days.” (Al Mughni, 9/18)

After Shaikh Abdurrahman bin Hasan quotes the saying of Ibn Taymiyyah from ‘Alminhaj’: “He (Ibn Taymiyyah) said “the rivals of Abu Bakr (ra) and their followers, like Musailimah al-Kadhdhab and his followers and others besides them, was the most famous in regard of irtidad. And also from the most apparent amongst the people in irtidad are; the Alghulliyya whom Ali (ra) burned with fire, when they claimed Ilahiyya in him (Ali) and (also) the Assab’iyya; followers of Abullah bin Sab’a, who exposed blaspheming Abu Bakr (ra) and Umar (ra). Mukhtar bin Ubeid was the first one, amongst those who ascribe themselves to Islam, from whom claiming of prophethood was apparent. And he was from the Shia. So it is known that; amongst the people, the most who become murtad are from the Shia, more than it (irtidad) is found in other sects. And this is the reason that a worst irtidad is not known than the irtidad of Al-ghulliyya, like An-nuseiriyya, and (also) irtidad of Ismailiyya Batiniyya and their likes” commented: “And from what is known: verily many amongst these people are ignorant who thinks that they are upon the truth, but with all that, Shaikhul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah ruled upon their bad irtidad.” (Ad Durar Assaniyya 11/479-482)

Hattabi states: “Ibn Arabi in the beginning of his book Kitab ul Tawassut fi Usuluddeen had stated: “Don’t you see the ulamaa had seen it mustahab to give the murtad some time. For this reason for some time patience will precede. It could be that his doubts with certainty and his ignorance with ‘ilm trade place and rid. Of course it is not necessary that this effects with ‘ilm of sahih view at first. Even this refutes the principle of ignorance is an excuse which individuals who came later put forth. Surely Irtidad usually develops with ignorance and fasid ta’weel of the doer. ‘Ilm is not necessary for this to be established.” (Mawahib’ul Jalil bi Sharh’l Muhtasar’il Halil Hattabi, 2/281)

Shawkani stated: “However as it is not hidden from you, among the reasons of Irtidad ‘ilm will not be considered in nothing that is stable (it will not be looked at whether the doer has knowledge or not). The meaning of this is that it will not be taken under consideration whether the individual who performs a word of kufr or and act of kufr knows the meaning (of what he did).” (ad-Durr'un-Nadida, 43)

When a Muslim apostatizes from the faith, an exposition thereof is to be laid before him, in such a manner that if his apostasy should have arisen from any religious doubts or scruples, those may be removed. The reason for laying an exposition of the faith before him is that it is possible some doubts or errors may have arisen in his mind, which may be removed by such exposition; and as there are only two modes of repelling the sin of apostasy, namely, destruction or Islam, and Islam is preferable to destruction, the evil is rather to be removed by means of an exposition of the iman; but yet this exposition of the faith is not incumbent, (according to what the learned have remarked upon this head), since a call to the faith has already reached the apostate. An apostate is to be imprisoned for three days, within which time if he return to the faith, it is well: but if not, he must be slain. It is recorded in the Jama Sagheer that "an exposition of the faith is to be laid before an apostate, and if he refuse the faith, he must be slain:" and with respect to what is above stated, that "he is to be imprisoned for three days," it only implies that if he require a delay, three days may be granted him, as such is the term generally

admitted and allowed for the purpose of consideration. It is recorded from Hanifa and Abu Yusuf that the granting of a delay of three days is laudable, whether the apostate require it or not: and it is recorded from Shafii that it is incumbent on the Imam to delay for three days, and that it is not lawful for him to put the apostate to death before the lapse of that time; since it is most probable that a Muslim will not apostatize but from some doubt or error arising in his mind; wherefore some time is necessary for consideration; and this is fixed at three days. The arguments of our scholars upon this point are two fold. First, Allah says, in the Qur'an, "Slay the unbelievers," without any reserve of a delay of three days being granted to them; and RasulAllah (saw) has also said "Slay the man who changes his religion," without mentioning anything concerning a delay: secondly, an apostate is an infidel enemy, who has received a call to the faith, wherefore he may be slain upon the instant, without any delay. An apostate is termed on this occasion an infidel enemy, because he is undoubtedly such; and he is not protected, since he has not required a protection; neither is he a Dhimmi, because capitation-tax has not been accepted from him; hence it is proved that he is an infidel enemy. It is to be observed that, in these rules, there is no difference made between an apostate who is a freeman, and one who is a slave, as the arguments upon which they are established apply equally to both descriptions. The repentance of an apostate is sufficiently manifested in his formally renouncing all religions except the religion of Islam, because apostates are not a sect: or if he formally renounce the religion which he embraced upon his apostasy, it suffices, since thus the end is obtained. If any person kills an apostate, before an exposition of the faith has been laid open to him, it is abominable, (that is, it is laudable to let him continue unmolested). Nothing however, is incurred by the slayer; because the infidelity of an alien renders the killing of him admissible; and an exposition of the faith, after a call to the faith, is not necessary. If a Muslim woman becomes an apostate, she is not put to death, but is imprisoned, until she returns to the faith. Shafii maintains that she is to be put to death; because of the tradition before cited; and also, because, as men are put to death for apostasy solely for this reason, that it is a crime of great magnitude, and therefore requires that its punishment be proportionally severe, (namely, death), so the apostasy of a woman being likewise (like that of a man) a crime of great magnitude, it follows that her punishment should be the same as that of a man. The arguments of our doctors upon this point are twofold. First, the prophet has forbidden the slaying of women, without making any distinction between those who are apostates, and those who are original infidels. Secondly, the original principle in the retribution of offences is to delay it to a future state, (in other words, not to inflict punishment here, but to refer it to hereafter), since if retribution were executed in this world, it would render defective the state of trial, as men would avoid committing sin from apprehension of punishment, and therefore would be in the state of persons acting under compulsion, and not of free agents: but in the case of apostasy of men the punishment is not deferred to a future state, because it is indispensably requisite to repel their present wickedness, (namely, their becoming enemies to the faith), which wickedness cannot be conceived of women, who are, by natural weakness of frame, incapable thereof: contrary to men. A female apostate, therefore, is the same as an original female infidel; and as the killing of the one is forbidden, so is the killing of the other also. She is however, to be imprisoned, until she returns to the faith; because, as she refuses the right of Allah after having acknowledged it, she must be compelled, by means of imprisonment, to render Allah his right, in the same manner as she would be imprisoned on account of the right of the individual. It is written in the Jami Sagheer, "A female apostate is to be compelled to return to the faith, whether she be free, or a slave". The slave is to be compelled by her

master; she is to be compelled, for the reasons already recited; and this compulsion is to be executed by her master, because in this a regard is had to the right both of God and of the master. It is elsewhere mentioned that a female apostate must be daily beaten with severity until she return to the faith.” (Hidaya, 2/225-228)

Similar to the above quotations there are many narrations in the fiqh sources of the valuable scholars. If we had not feared extending this topic, we would have added more examples. All of these show takfir of those who invalidate tawhid. Let alone they do not rely this upon any other but the details of the furu of sharee'ah (doing knowingly). However as long as the doer of furu does not have knowledge of it being haraam he will not be made takfir. The reason is as mentioned previously, the evidence of tawhid is 'aql, fitrah and misak. These do not show need for an envoy. Furu is the opposite of this surely it relies on the reaching of risalah.

At the end of this section we will mention ten articles by shaikh Muhammad ibn AbdulWahhab regarding the ten which invalidate Islam. He states:

10 invalidaters of Islam

The ulamaa have mentioned ten actions that negate Islam. These are:

1- Associating other deities with the worship of the One God Who has no partners. Allah says:

“Surely Allah does not forgive it when partners are ascribed to Him. He forgives everything except this for whomever He wishes.” (an-Nisa 4/116)

2- Relying on an intermediary between oneself and Allah when seeking intercession.

3- Refusal to condemn the kufr of those who rely on other deities instead of Allah, or doubting that they are disbelievers, or approving of their religion, is itself disbelief.

4- Belief that there is a more perfect guidance than that of RasulAllah (saw) or that there is a form of governance that is preferable to this, such as someone who prefers the rule of tyrants to that of RasulAllah (saw).

5- Dislike of any part of the Revelation, even though one may act upon it, is disbelief. Allah says:

“That is because they hate the Revelation of Allah; so He has made their deeds fruitless.” (Muhammad 47/9)

6- Disparaging any part of the deen or any aspect of reward or punishment:

“If thou dost question them, they declare (with emphasis): ‘We were only talking idly and in play.’ Say:

‘Was it at Allah, and His Signs, and His Messenger that ye were mocking?’ Make ye no excuses: ye have rejected Faith after ye had accepted it.” (at-Tawba 9/65-66)

7- Practicing magic either black or white, is proof of disbelief:

“But neither of these (angels Kharut and Marut) taught anyone (Such things) without saying: ‘We are only for trial; so do not blaspheme.’” (Baqara 2/102)

8- Helping and assisting the disbelievers in overcoming the Muslims:

“Whoever among you takes them for friends is surely (one) of them. Surely Allah does not guide wrongdoing people.” (al-Maida 5/51)

9- Belief that it is not necessary to follow the Prophet, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, and that it is permitted to step outside the law of Allah, as al-Khidr did when he exceeded what had been revealed to Moses. This is disbelief.

10- Willful neglect of Allah’s deen, neither learning it nor acting upon it. Allah says:

“And who does greater wrong than he who is reminded of the signs of his Lord, and then turns away from them. Surely We shall requite the guilty.” (as-Sajda 32/22)

No distinction is made as regards these actions in terms of intention, whether a person is joking or serious or even acts out of fear. The only excuse is ikrah (compulsion). These ten actions are extremely dangerous and exceedingly common. Every Muslim should beware of them and feel a real fear in his heart of even drawing near them. (Imam Muhammad Ibn Abdulwahhab, Mualafat, 5/212-214; Aqidat'ul Muwahhidin, 456-457) **d- The hukm of the one who changes his deen after Tawhid and Islam**

Apostasy, or riddah in Arabic, literally means defection or backsliding. (Al-Mawrid: A Modern Arabic-English Dictionary, 582) As an Islamic legal term, it means denouncing Islam as one's religion by a Muslim. The word apostate in Arabic is murtad and one who apostatizes is called man artad an deenihi, i.e. "Who turns his back on religion." Two words are used for apostasy in Muslim law: irtidad and riddah. The latter term relates to apostasy from Islam into unbelief, kufr; the former, from Islam to some other religion, for example, Christianity. (Mufradat gharibu'l-Qur'an lil-shaikh ar-Raghib, 191) Al-Azdi stated on the term of 'radda': "Irtidad is an Arabic term and it is a derivative from its root. I rejected it meaning I refused it: I will reject it. To decline, it had been declined. It will be said regarding the one with an ugly face: There is radda (when you look at it an ugliness that sickens and makes you turn around/ reject) on his face, to withdraw from something, to withdraw from Islam." (Jamharatu'l-lughah 1/72) Ibn Manzur recorded: "He turned his face from it. It is stated in the Qur'an 'if any of you Turn back from their faith'." (al-Baqarah 2/217) it is a noun meaning Irtidad. To turn (away) from Islam. It is said regarding an individual who becomes kafir while a Muslim: So and so turned from his deen..." (Lisanu'l – Arab, 4/153-155) Jawhari in as-Sihah (1/470); Zabidi in Taju'l-Arus (2/351); Ahmad Ridha in Mujamu'l-Matnu'l-Lughah

(2/571) and also other dictionaries such as Mujamu'l-Wasit (1/338) mentioned in the same manner regarding the definition of the term 'riddah' which is a noun of 'irtidad' as returning to kufr from Islam. Imam Raghīb al-Asfahani stated the following on the term of 'radda': "The words 'irtidad' and 'riddatu' mean, 'to return on the same path as one had traversed earlier', however the word 'riddatu' is specifically used to indicate a return to kufr, whereas the word 'irtidad' may be used to indicate a return to disbelief or to any other matter, Allah says: "Surely those who turn their backs" (Muhammad 47/26) and Allah says: "O ye who believe! whose among you turns back from his religion" (al-Maida 5/55)" (Mujamu Mufradatil al-fazl Qur'an)

Imam Samarqandi al Hanafi states the following regarding irtidad: "Irtidad consists of turning from and turning face from iman." (Tufetul-Fuqaha; v7, p134) Regarding irtidad Kalyubi ash Shafi stated: "Irtidad; expels from Islam with kufr niyyah, kufr word or kufr action. There is no difference between the kufr word being a result of play, stubbornness or belief." (Kalyubi and Umayra 4/174; Ataullah, Sharhul Usul, 3) Imam ibn un Najjar al Hanbali states regarding irtidad: "An individual who accepts kufr either by play, real coercion or willingly after having become a Muslim is called Murdad." (Muntahal-Iradat 2/4989) The view of Imam Alish al Maliki regarding Irtidad is as follows: "Irtidad is a Muslim becoming kafir either with an open statement or a word or act which necessitates irtidad." (Minah-ul-Jalil 4/461)

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) said: "With regard to irtidad from Islam, whereby a person becomes a kafir, whether a mushrik or a Jew or Christian, if he dies in that state then all his good deeds will be wiped out, according to scholarly consensus, as the Qur'an says in more than one place. For example Allah says: "And whosoever of you turns back from his religion and dies as a disbeliever, then his deeds will be lost in this life and in the Hereafter" (al-Baqarah 2/217) "And whosoever disbelieves in Faith, then fruitless is his work" (al-Maida 5/5) "But if they had joined in worship others with Allah, all that they used to do would have been of no benefit to them" (al-An'am 6/88)." (Majmu' al-Fatawa, 4/257, 268) **1- There is an ijma (concensus) among the sahabah that the one who made irtidad would be killed**

Riddat during the Abu Bakr (ra) era

Ibn Kathir quoted from Abu Bakr al-Bayhaqi the hadith of Muhammad b. Yusuf al-Firyabi (al-Bukhari said that he was the best of the people of his time) from `Ubbad b. Kathir ar-Ramli, one of his shaykhs (Ibn al-Madini said that he was reliable and there is no harm in him) from Abdur-Rahman b. Hurmuz al-A'raj (one of the Tabi'un who died in Alexandria) from Abu Hurayrah who said, "By Allah, there is no god but Him. If Abu Bakr had not been appointed, Allah would not have been worshipped." Then he said it a second and a third time. It was said to him, "Easy, Abu Hurayra!" He said, "RasulAllah (saw) sent Usama b. Zayd with seven hundred men to Syria. When he alighted at Dhu'l-Khasab, RasulAllah (saw) gathered round him and they said, "Abu Bakr, turn those men back. They are sent to the Greeks when the Arabs around Madina have apostatized?" He said, "By Allah, there is no god but Him. If the dogs were to snap at the feet of the wives of RasulAllah (saw) I still would not turn back an army which RasulAllah (saw) had sent nor undo what RasulAllah (saw) had tied." He sent Usama. He did not pass by a tribe who wanted to apostatize without them saying, "If it had not been that those men had strength, they would never have sent out the like of these. We will wait until they have encountered the Greeks. They met

the Greeks and defeated and killed them and returned safely, so the tribes remained firm in Islam. Umar and others said to him, "If the Arabs deny you the zakah, then be patient with them." He said, "By Allah, if they will not give me a camel-halter which is due to RasulAllah (saw) I will fight them for it. I will fight those who make any distinction between zakah and the prayer!" When the army of Usama went on its course to eastern Jordan, the delegates of the tribes began to come to Madina. They confirmed the prayer but refused to pay zakah." (Al Bidaya wa'n-Nihaya 6/305)

Ibn Kathir said, "Some of them used as a proof His words, may He be exalted! 'Take sadaqa from their property by which to purify them and pray over them. Their prayer is a comfort for them.'" (at-Tawbah 9/103) They said, 'We only give our zakah for his prayer which is a comfort for us.' The Companions spoke with the Siddiq about leaving them alone in spite of their refusing to pay zakah and to unite them until iman was firm in their hearts. Then after that they would give zakah. The Siddiq refused to do that and rejected it." Most people related in their books-except for Ibn Majah from Abu Hurayrah that Umar b. al-Khattab said to Abu Bakr, "How can you fight people when RasulAllah (saw) said, 'I am commanded to fight people until they testify that there is no god but Allah and that Muhammad is RasulAllah. When they say that, their blood and their property are protected from me except by a right.'" Abu Bakr said, "By Allah, if they refused to give me a camel-halter (or rein), which they used to give to RasulAllah (saw) I will fight them for refusing it." Umar said, "I see that Allah has expanded Abu Bakr's breast to fight the one who makes a distinction between the prayer and zakah. I recognise that it is the truth." (al-Bidaya wa'n-Nihaya, 6/311)...al-Qasim b. Muhammad b. Abu Bakr as- Siddiq (and he is one of the the seven fuqaha') said, "Asad, Ghatafan and Tayy' gathered with Tulayha al-Asadi and they sent delegations to Madina and stayed with the notable people who put them up with the exception of al-Abbas. They took them to Abu Bakr for him to allow them to do the prayer and not pay the zakah. Allah made Abu Bakr resolve on the truth and he said, "If they refuse a camel-strap to me, you must fight them." It was said, "With whom will you fight them?" He said, "By myself until the side of its neck is on its own." He sent Amirs over the armies and governors into the lands chosen for them with due consideration. That was one of the most exact things that he did and the best of what he did for Islam." (Al Bidaya wa'n-Nihaya, 6/312; Ibnu'l-Arabi, al-Awasim min al-Qawasim)

Narrated from Abu Hurayrah (ra): "When RasulAllah (saw) died and Abu Bakr (ra) became his successor and some of the Arabs reverted to disbelief, Umar (ra) said, 'O Abu Bakr! How can you fight these people although RasulAllah said, I have been ordered to fight the people till they say: None has the right to be worshipped but Allah, and whoever said, None has the right to be worshipped but Allah, Allah will save his property and his life from me, unless (he does something for which he receives legal punishment) justly, and his account will be with Allah?' Abu Bakr said, 'By Allah! I will fight whoever differentiates between prayers and Zakah as Zakah is the right to be taken from property (according to Allah's Orders). By Allah! If they refused to pay me even a kid they used to pay to RasulAllah, I would fight with them for withholding it.' Umar said, 'By Allah: It was nothing, but I noticed that Allah opened Abu Bakr's chest towards the decision to fight, therefore I realized that his decision was right'." (Bukhari, 'Kitaab Istitaabat ul-Murtaddeen' Dealing with the Apostates, 'Baab Qatala man Abaa Qubool al-Faraa'id wa Maa Nasaboo ila'r-Riddah' Chapter: execution of the one who turns away from the Obligations and those who have apostatized; Muslim, 'Kitaab ul-Eemaan', 'Baab al-Amr bi-Qitaal an-Naas Hatta yuqoolu

‘La-ilaha illallah wa yuqeemu Salah...’ The Command to Fight the People Until they Profess That There is No God Worthy of Worship Except Allah and Establish the Prayer...; Nasai ‘Kitaab ul-Jihaad in Baab Wujooab ul-Jihaad’ Chapter: The Obligation of Jihaad; ‘Kitaab ut-Tahreem’; Tirmidhi; Abu Dawud ‘Kitaab uz-Zakah’)

Imam Nawawi mentioned al-Khattabi’s explanation of the hadith and mentioned that the Murtaddeen who the Sahabah fought against were of different types: two types which apostatized from Islam and some of these went back to the worship of idols and another type of apostate who followed Musaylimah and al-Aswad al-Ansi and believed them in their enmity against the Prophethood. A third type were those who made a distinction between Salah and Zakah and accepted Salah but rejected Zakah and among these were those who did not prevent Zakah to be paid but their leaders did prevent it from being paid. (Sharh Sahih Muslim)

The summary of the account of Abu Bakr (ra) era in the History of Ibni Khaldun is that apart from the tribes of Quraish and Thaqif, the news of the apostasy of various Arab populations reached madinah. The crisis of the rebellion created by Musailima reached a critical point. Similarly, Ta’i and Asad tribes gathered around Tulaiha. The tribe of Ghatfan also apostatized. The people of Hawazan tribe refused to pay Zakah. From Yemen and Yamama the rebels expelled the rulers and administrators appointed by RasulAllah (saw). After the death of RasulAllah (saw), Abu Bakr (ra) tried to counsel the rebels by means of negotiations through emissaries and via correspondence as well. He waited for the army to return that had gone out under the command of Usama. However, with the intent to attack, the rebels advanced towards madinah. They encamped at al-Abraq and Dhul Qarsa just outside madinah and sent a message to Abu Bakr (ra) that they were willing to say the Salat but wanted payment of Zakah to be dispensed with. Abu Bakr (ra) refused to agree to this demand and appointed Ali (ra), Zubair (ra) and Abdullah bin Mas’ud (ra) to stand guard at various outward points of madinah. The people of madinah started gathering in the mosque. A delegation of the rebels got back to their comrades and informed them that the number of Muslims present in madinah was very small. Consequently, the rebels attacked the outskirts of madinah. In response Abu Bakr (ra) took the Muslims, who had gathered in the mosque, and they went out on camelbacks to confront the enemy. The enemy retreated. However, even in retreat, it employed different techniques to startle the camels of the Muslims. As a result, the camels ran uncontrollably towards madinah. Although the Muslims did not suffer any casualties, yet the enemy deemed them to be weak and sent a message to their rebel comrades to come and join them in attacking the Muslims as they were in a weak position. Upon this Abu Bakr (ra) gathered the Muslims at dawn and went very near to where the enemy was and attacked them. Even before the sun had risen, the enemy retreated. Upon return, the tribes of Banu Dhubyan and ‘Abs as well as other tribes began killing the unarmed Muslims of their region. In response Abu Bakr (ra) vowed that he would definitely take revenge for each and every Muslim." (Ibn Khaldun, Tarikh Ibn Khaldun, II/401-414)

Tabari recorded the following regarding the same era: “As soon as the news of the illness of RasulAllah (saw) was out, it was also reported that Musailama had taken over Yamama and Aswad ‘Ansi had taken over Yemen. Soon Tulaiha also claimed prophethood, thus becoming a standard bearer of rebellion. He gathered an army and went towards a place called Sumaira’ to fight the Muslims. The populace followed

him in great numbers and the situation thus became critical. Moreover, Banu Rabi'a announced rebellion and apostasy in the region of Bahrain, and claimed that they would restore monarchy into the dynasty of Mundhar once again and appointed Mundhar bin Naghman their king. Soon afterwards, the governors of the RasulAllah (saw) sent reports that the high and low had rebelled in all the regions and the rebels were persecuting the Muslims in all sorts of ways. In the beginning Abu Bakr (ra) continued to have a dialogue with the rebels in the manner that RasulAllah (saw) used to hold negotiations with the rebels through the emissaries. However, the tribes of 'Abs and Dhubyan started advancing their army towards madinah while brutally murdering the unarmed Muslims of their region. The other tribes followed suit. At this Abu Bakr (ra) vowed that in return of every single Muslim killed, he would kill one rebel. In fact he would kill more. Subsequently, that is exactly what he did. He sent a message to Khalid bin Walid (ra) that promptly after the capture; he was to kill each rebel who had killed a Muslim in a most exemplary way. Before his demise, RasulAllah (saw) had sent Amr bin al-'As (ra) to Jaifar ('Ummah). When he returned after the death of RasulAllah (saw) the Muslims gathered around him to hear the situation of the rebels. He recounted that the rebels were encamped along the entire route of Daba to madinah. The instigation of rebellion and apostasy took place in the time of RasulAllah (saw) by Aswad 'Ansi in the region of Yemen. The tribe of Madhhaj joined them and the havoc of its rebellion started spreading like wildfire. In addition to its infantry, the rebellious army that joined him had 700 mounted men. He warned the administrators of the Islamic government thus: 'O, usurpers! Return our country to us. You may keep whatever wealth you have accumulated but get out of our land.' The Muslim administrator was then replaced with Amr bin Hazam and Khalid bin Sa'id bin Al-'As as the rulers. Later, Aswad took his army to attack San'a' and having murdered Shaihar bin Badhan, who was the administrator appointed by RasulAllah (saw), seized San'a and murdered the other Muslims. Mu'adh bin Jabal (ra) escaped and saved his life. Once he reached Ma'rib, he informed Abu Musa al-Ash'ari (ra) of the situation. They both came towards Hadramaut and thus the entire country of Yemen came in the clutches of Aswad. His government was established there and his power increased. The Muslims eventually sent him hellbound in a battle at Yamama. Tulaiha made a claim to prophethood and having gathered the rebels got entrenched at a place called Sumaira'. The number of people who followed him was so great that the ground could not accommodate them. They divided themselves in two groups and sent their delegations to madinah. Abu Bakr (ra) refused to accept their demands. The delegation returned to its comrades and told them that the Muslims were very few in number and suggested to carry out an attack. Following these negotiations Abu Bakr (ra) appointed small contingents to guard the fringes of madinah. He informed the Muslims that an epidemic of rebellion had spread all over the country and the delegation of the rebels had figured out the scantiness of the Muslims and that it was a matter of conjecture whether the enemy would attack during the night or would wait till daybreak and that the Muslims should be fully prepared. Only three days had elapsed that the rebel army attacked madinah at night. Abu Bakr (ra) gathered the Muslims and came forth to battle and made the enemy retreat. The majority of the tribe of Banu Hanifah joined Musailama. He seized Yamama and expelled its governor, Thumama bin Athal (ra) who had been appointed by RasulAllah (saw). Musailama gathered a lot of strength and force. A woman by the name of Sajah, who had made a claim to prophethood, came forth to battle with him. He was apprehensive of her and having reconciled with her, persuaded her into battle with Muslims in these words: 'Had the Quraish (Muslims) been fair, they would have kept half the country and handed over the other half to us. However, they have been oppressive to us. Will you be

willing to marry me, so that we can both get together with our tribes and swallow the entire Arab tribes.' He thus married Sajah and came out to fight the Muslims. His army numbered 40,000. Khalid bin Walid (ra) confronted him and defeated him." (Muhammad bin Jarir Al-Tabari, Tarikhul Tabari, Vol III the account of 11AH)

"Majority of Banu Hanifah joined Musailama, the great liar. He seized Yamama and expelled the governor of RasulAllah (saw). He (the Governor) informed RasulAllah (saw) about it; after the passing away of RasulAllah (saw) he informed Abu Bakr (ra). In response to this Abu Bakr (ra) sent Khalid bin Walid (ra) with a huge army to battle Musailama." (Bakri, Tarikhul Khamis part pertaining to the account 11AH)

Ayni said: "Abu Bakr (ra) only fought against those who refused to pay Zakah because they stopped Zakah through the sword and made war against the Muslims." (Ayni, Umdatul Qari Sharhu Sahih Bukhari, Kitabu Istatabatil Murtaddin wal Mu'anidin wa Qitalihim wa Ma Nusibu Ilar Riddati, 14/81)

It is also documented in the historical records of al-Tabari and Ibni Khaldun that: "After the war, when Abu Bakr (ra) was victorious over the rebels, some of them were made prisoners and some slaves." (Tarikhul Tabari, Part III, Hawadith 11AH, pp 259-263; Tarikh Ibni Khaldun, Al-Qismur Rabi'i, 2/864-865)

"In the era of Abu Bakr (ra) a woman by the name of Umme Qirfa had apostatized after accepting Islam. Abu Bakr (ra) demanded repentance from her but she did not comply. Abu Bakr (ra) had her killed." (Darakutni; Bayhaqi)

According to the Hanafi ulamaa the reason was her war against Islam and not being a murtad: "The killing of this woman was ordered because she had thirty sons and she would constantly instigate and incite all thirty sons against war with the Muslims; in order to break the might of these brothers. Thus the mother was killed for the crime of instigation, only to give the clear message to her sons that if their mother incites them against Muslims and if they think that they are strong and powerful, they should, if they can, save their mother. Yet, after their mother was killed, their lives were saved to show to the world that if by taking one life a mischief can be subverted, then only that life should be taken." (Sarakhshi, al-Mabsut 10/110)

The era of Umar (ra)

"Amr bin al-As, Governor of Egypt, wrote to Umar (ra) that a man had accepted Islam but became an infidel, returned to Islam, but once again disbelieved. He had repeated that process many a time. Should his Islam be accepted or not? Umar (ra) replied that as long as Allah (awj) accepted his Islam, he should keep on doing so. Islam should be presented to him, if he accepted, his life should be spared, otherwise he should be put to death." (Kanzul Ummal, Kitabu Imani Wal Islami, Min Qismil Af'al, Al-Faslul Khamis Fi Hukmil Islami, Al-Irtidadu Wa Ahkamuhu Part I, # 1463)

Sad ibn Abi Waqqas and Abu Musa Ashari sent a messenger to Umar after the Battle of Tustar. The

messenger presented a report of the events to Umar. Finally Umar asked: Did anything unusual happen? He said: Yes, Leader of the Faithful. We caught an Arab who had become a kafir after accepting Islam. Umar asked: Then what did you do with him? He said: We killed him. At that, Umar said: Why did you not confine him to a room, put a lock on the door, keep him there for three days and daily throw him a loaf of bread? Perhaps during that time he may have repented. O God! This act did not take place at my command or in my presence; nor after hearing about it am I pleased with it. Nevertheless Umar enquired no further about the matter from Sad and Abu Musa Ashari, nor did he plan to punish them. (Tahawi, Sharh Ma'ani al-Athar; Bayhaqi; Muwatta; al-Shafi'i, Kitab al-Umm)

During the era of Umar (ra) when Abdullah ibn Masud (ra) was chief judge of Kufah under him, Abdullah ibn Masud was informed that in one of the mosques of the Banu Hanifah some people were testifying that Musaylimah was a messenger of Allah. Hearing this, Abdullah sent police to arrest and bring them. When they were brought before him, they all repented and promised never to do it again. Abdullah let all of them go except one, Abdullah ibn al-Nawahah, whom he punished by death. The people said: How is it that you have given two conflicting verdicts in the same case? Abdullah replied that Ibn al-Nawahah was the very man who has been sent by Musaylimah as an ambassador to the Prophet (Muhammad). I was present at that time. Another man, Hajar ibn Wathal, was also with him as a partner in this diplomatic mission. RasulAllah asked both of them: Do you bear witness that I am RasulAllah? They both responded by asking: Do you bear witness that Musaylimah is RasulAllah? Hearing that, RasulAllah replied: If it were permitted to execute the delegates of a political mission, I would execute you both. After relating this event, Abdullah said: For this reason I punished Ibn al-Nawahah by death. (Tahawi, Sharh Ma'ani al-Athar)

The era of Uthman (ra)

Some men who were spreading the claim of Musaylimah were captured in Kufah. Uthman (ra) was informed in writing about it. He wrote in response that the true religion (din-i haqq) and the confession: "There is no god except Allah and Muhammad is RasulAllah", should be presented before them. Whoever accepts it and reveals his rejection of Musaylimah should be released. Whoever upholds the religion of Musaylimah should be executed. (Tahawi, Sharh Ma'ani al-Athar)

The era of Ali (ra)

It is narrated from Ayyub from Ikrimah who said: "The heretics (zindeeq = The one who conceals unbelief and makes an outward show of belief) were brought to Ali (ra) and he executed them by fire and this news reached Ibn Abbas who said: 'If it was me I wouldn't have executed them by fire due to the forbiddance of doing this by RasulAllah (saw): Do not punish with what Allah punishes with (i.e. fire). I would have executed them on account of what RasulAllah said when he stated whoever changes his religion – kill him (i.e. execute)'." (Bukhari, 'Kitaab Istataabat ul-Murtaddeen wa'l-Mu'aaniddeen wa Qitaalahum' Dealing with the Apostates and Those who Stubbornly Hate Islam and Confronting Them; Imam Shafii, al-Umm, 'al-Murtaddeen 'an il-Islam' Those who Apostate from Islam, 1/257; al-Humaydi, Musnad; Abu Dawud, Kitaab ul-Hudood, 'the ruling of those who apostatize'; Nasai, 'on the ruling of the

apostate, # 4059; Tirmidhi, 'What has Arrived Regarding the Murtad'; Ibn Majah)

Ali was informed that some people regarded him as their Lord (Rabb). He called them and asked: What do you say? They said: You are our Lord, our Creator and Sustainer. Ali said: You are in a sad situation. I am a servant like you. Like you I eat and drink. If I obey Allah, He rewards me. If I disobey Him, I fear He will punish me. Therefore fear Allah and abandon your confession. But they refused. The next day Qanbar came and reported the people were saying the same thing. He called them, and on enquiring about the matter, they repeated the same things. The third day Ali called and threatened them: If you say the same thing, I will kill you in a most terrible manner. Still they remained adamant in their opinion. Finally Ali had a pit prepared and a fire burning in it. Then he said: Look, stop this confession immediately. Otherwise I will throw you into this pit. But they persisted in their affirmation. Then at Ali's command all of them were thrown into the pit. (Tahawi, Sharh Ma'ani al-Athar, 239)

A man who was formerly a Christian, then was Muslim, and again became a Christian was brought before Ali (ra). Ali asked him: What is the cause of your conduct? He replied: I have found the religion of the Christians better than your religion. Ali asked: What is your belief about Jesus? He said: He is my Lord (Rabb); or else he said: He is Lord of Ali. Hearing this, Ali ordered that he be executed. (Tahawi, Sharh Ma'ani al-Athar)

Ali was informed about a group of Christians who had become Muslims and then became Christians again. Ali arrested them, summoned them before himself and enquired about the truth of the matter. They said: We were Christians. Then we were offered the choice of remaining Christians or becoming Muslims. We chose Islam. But now it is our opinion that no religion is more excellent than our first religion. Therefore we have become Christians now. Hearing this, Ali ordered these people to be executed and their children enslaved. (Tahawi, Sharh Ma'ani al-Athar)

When Ali was in Rahbah, someone informed him that the occupants of a particular house kept an idol in it and worshipped it. Hearing this, Ali himself went there. The idol was discovered after searching. Ali set the house on fire and it was burnt along with its occupants. (Fath al-Bari, 12/239)

A man who had been a Muslim but became a kafir was arrested. This happened during the time of Ali and he was brought to Ali. Ali gave him a one month period to repent and then enquired of him. But he refused to repent. Finally Ali had him put to death. (Kanz al-'Ummal, 1/8)

Tabari narrates the incidents during the era of Ali (ra) and said: Among them were many Christians who had accepted Islam, but when dissension had developed in Islam had said, "By God, our religion (din) from which we have departed is better and more correct than that which these people follow. Their religion does not stop them from shedding blood, terrifying the roads, and seizing properties." And they returned to their former religion. Al-Khirrit met them and said to them, "Woe unto you! Do you know the precept (hukm) of 'Ali regarding any Christian who accepts Islam and then reverts to Christianity? By Allah he will not hear anything they say, he will not consider any excuse, he will not accept any repentance, and he will not summon them to it. His precept regarding them is immediate cutting off of

the head when he gets hold of them. Those of the Banu Najiyah and other who were in that district came to him, and many men joined him.....I was in the army that 'Ali b. Abi Talib sent against the Banu Najiyah. We came to them and found them split into three groups. Our commander said to one of these groups, "What are you?" and they replied, "We are a Christian people who do not consider any religion to be better than ours, and we hold fast to it. Our commander said to them, "Be off with you (i'tazilu)!" He said to another band, "What are you?" and they said, "We were Christians, but we accepted Islam and we hold fast to our Islam." He said to them, "Be off with you!" Then he said to the third group, "What are you?" and they said, "We are a people who were Christians. We accepted Islam but we do not think that any religion is better than our previous one." He said to them, "Accept Islam!" but they refused. He said to his men, "When I rub my head three times, attack them and kill the fighting men and make captive the dependants." (al-Tabari, Ta'rikh al-rusul wa'l-muluk 17/187-188)

...But there was an old man among the, a Christian called al-Rumahis b. Mansur, who said, "By Allah the only error I have made since attaining reason was abandoning my religion, the religion of truth, for your, the religion of wickedness. No by God, I will not leave my religion and I will not accept yours so long as I live." Ma'qil brought him forward and cut off his head." (al-Tabari, Ta'rikh al-rusul wa'l-muluk 17/191)

From the letter of Ma'qil to the caliph Ali (ra): "... For anyone who had apostatized, we offered return to Islam or else death. As for the Christians, we made them captive and led them off so that they might be a warning for those of the protected people who come after them not to refuse the jizyah and not to make bold against our religion and community, for the protected people are of little account and lowly in status." (al-Tabari, Ta'rikh al-rusul wa'l-muluk 17/192) **2- Among the ulamaa there is a consensus on the execution of the murtad**

bn Abbas transmits an utterance of RasulAllah (saw), "Slay him, who changes his religion" or "behead him" (Ibn Majah; Nasai; al-Tayalisi; Malik; Bukhari; Tirmidhi; Abu Dawud; Ahmad)

According to another tradition of Ibn Abbas (ra) and Aisha (raa), RasulAllah (saw) is said to have permitted the blood to be shed of him "who abandons his religion and separates himself from the community (jama'ah)" (Bukhari; Muslim; al-Nasai; Ibn Majah; Abu Dawud; Tirmidhi; Ahmad)

It is narrated from Abdullah ibn Mas'ud (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) said, "The blood of a Muslim who confesses that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that I am His Messenger, cannot be shed except in three cases: in Qisas (equality in punishment) for murder, a married person who commits illegal sexual intercourse and the one who reverts from Islam (Apostate) and leaves the Muslims." (Muslim; Bukhari; Abu Dawud)

Narrated from Ikrima, "Some zindeeq were brought to Ali and he burnt them. The news of this event, reached Ibn Abbas who said, "If I had been in his place, I would not have burnt them, as RasulAllah forbade it, saying, "Do not punish anybody with Allah's punishment (fire)." I would have killed them according to the statement of RasulAllah, "Whoever changed his Islamic religion, then kill him." (Bukhari)

Narrated from Abu Buraida, "Abu Musa said.....Behold there was a fettered man beside Abu Musa. Muadh asked, "Who is this (man)?" Abu Musa said, "He was a Jew and became a Muslim and then reverted back to Judaism." Then Abu Musa requested Muadh to sit down but Muadh said, "I will not sit down till he has been killed. This is the judgment of Allah and his messenger," and repeated it thrice. Then Abu Musa ordered that the man be killed, and he was killed. Abu Musa added, "Then we discussed the night prayers (Nasai; Bukhari; Abu Dawud)

Narrated from Ibn Abbas (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) said, "You will be resurrected (and assembled) bare-footed, naked and uncircumcised." RasulAllah (saw) then recited the ayah: "As We began the first creation, We shall repeat it: A promise We have undertaken. Truly we shall do it." (al-Anbiya 21/104) He added, "The first to be dressed will be Ibrahim. Then some of my companions will take to the right and to the left. I will say: 'My companions! It will be said, 'They had been renegades since you left them.' I will then say what the Pious Slave Isa, the son of Maryam said: 'And I was a witness over them while I dwelt amongst them; when You did take me up, You were the Watcher over them, and You are a Witness to all things. If You punish them, they are Your slaves, and if you forgive them, You, only You are the All-Mighty the All-Wise.' "(al-Maida 5/117-118) Narrated Quaggas, "Those were the apostates who renegade from Islam during the Caliphate of Abu Bakr who fought them". (Bukhari)

It is narrated on the authority of Abu Hurayrah (ra) that when RasulAllah (saw) breathed his last and Abu Bakr was appointed as his successor, those amongst the Arabs who wanted to become apostates became apostates. Umar b. Khattab (ra) said to Abu Bakr (ra): Why would you fight against the people, when RasulAllah (saw) declared: I have been directed to fight against people so long as they do not say: There is no god but Allah, and he who professed it was granted full protection of his property and life on my behalf except for a right? His (other) affairs rest with Allah. Upon this Abu Bakr said: By Allah, I would definitely fight against him who severed prayer from Zakat, for it is the obligation upon the rich. By Allah, I would fight against them even to secure the cord (used for hobbling the feet of a camel) which they used to give to RasulAllah (as zakat) but now they have withheld it. Umar b. Khattab remarked: By Allah, I found nothing but the fact that Allah had opened the heart of Abu Bakr for (perceiving the justification of) fighting (against those who refused to pay Zakat) and I fully recognized that the (stand of Abu Bakr) was right. (Muslim)

Zaid b. Aslam reported that RasulAllah (saw) declared that the man who leaves the fold of Islam should be executed. (Muwatta)

Aisha (raa) reports that: "RasulAllah (saw) stated that it is unlawful to shed the blood of a Muslim other than for the following reasons: a. although married, he commits adultery or b. after being a Muslim he chooses kufr, or he takes someone's life." (Nasai)

Narrated from Uthman (ra) that he said: "I heard RasulAllah (saw) saying that it is unlawful to shed the blood of a Muslim except in three situations: a person who, being a Muslim, becomes a kafir; one who after marriage commits adultery; one who commits murder apart from having an authorization to take

life in exchange for another life. (Nasai)

In another narration it is reported from Uthman (ra) that he said: "I heard RasulAllah (saw) saying that it is unlawful to shed the blood of a Muslim with the exception of three crimes: the punishment of someone who after marriage commits adultery is stoning; retaliation is required against someone who intentionally commits murder; anyone who becomes an apostate after being a Muslim should be punished by death. (Nasai)

After RasulAllah (saw) conquered Mecca, prohibited fighting. He ordered six men and four women to be killed and several of them were apostates. Among them one was Abdullah Ibn Sa'd Ibn Abi Sarh. (Ibn Sa'd, Kitab al-Tabaqat al-Kabir, 2/168) al-Baidawi commented 'To me it has been revealed', when naught has been revealed to him" refers to Abdallah Ibn Sa'd Ibn Abi Sarh, who used to write for RasulAllah. The verse (al-Hajj 23/12) that says, "We created man of an extraction of clay" was revealed, and when Muhammad reached the part that says, "... thereafter We produced him as another creature (al-Hajj 23/14), Abdallah said, "So blessed be Allah the fairest of creators!" in amazement at the details of man's creation. RasulAllah (saw) said, "Write it down; for thus it has been revealed." Abdallah doubted and said, "If Muhammad is truthful then I receive the revelation as much as he does, and if he is a liar, what I said is as good as what he said." (Tafsir Anwar al-Tanzil wa Asrar al-Ta'wil)

It is narrated from Abdullah ibn Abbas that: "Abdullah ibn Abi Sarh was at one time secretary to RasulAllah (saw). Then Satan seized him and he joined the kuffar. When Mecca was conquered RasulAllah (saw) ordered that he be killed. Later, however, Uthman sought refuge for him and RasulAllah gave him refuge." (Abu Dawud)

This incident also narrated from Sad ibn Abi Waqqas: "When Mecca was conquered, Abdullah ibn Sad ibn Abi Sarh took refuge with Uthman ibn Affan. Uthman took him and they presented themselves to the Prophet, requesting: O RasulAllah, accept the allegiance of Abdullah. RasulAllah lifted his head, looked in his direction and remained silent. This happened three times and he (saw) only looked in his direction. Finally after three times he accepted his allegiance. Then he turned towards his Companions and said: Was there no worthy man among you who, when he saw me withholding my hand from accepting his allegiance, would step forward and kill this person? The people replied: O RasulAllah, we did not know your wish. Why did you not signal with your eyes? To this RasulAllah (saw) replied: It is unbecoming of a Prophet to glance in a stealthy manner." (Abu Dawud)

Ibn Sa'd in further details narrates: "A person of al-Ansar had taken a vow to kill Ibn Abi Sarh if he saw him. Uthman whose foster brother he was, came and interceded for him with the prophet. The Ansari was waiting for the signal of the prophet to kill him. Uthman interceded and he (saw) let him go. Then RasulAllah said to the Ansari, "Why did you not fulfil your vow?" He said, "O RasulAllah! I had my hand on the hilt of the sword waiting for your signal to kill him." RasulAllah said signalling would have been a breach of faith. "It does not behave the prophet to make signal." (Kitab al-Tabaqat al-Kabir, 2/168)

This incident is recorded by Ibn Ishaq "The apostle had instructed his commanders when they entered

Mecca only to fight those who resisted them, except a small number who were to be killed even if they were found beneath the curtains of the Kaba. Among them was Abdullah Sa'd, brother of the B. Amir Lu'ayy. The reason he ordered him to be killed was that he had been a Muslim and used to write down revelation; then he apostatized and returned to Quraysh and fled to Uthman Affan whose foster brother he was. The latter hid him until he brought him to the apostle after the situation in Mecca was tranquil, and asked that he might be granted immunity. They allege that the apostle remained silent for a long time till finally he said yes. Abdullah apostatized and Muhammad wanted him dead. Also, Abdullah was one of Muhammad's scribes and said that the reason he left Islam was because he was able to write his own words as the Qur'an with Muhammad's approval. Once he realized the Qur'an was a sham he left Islam. Later, when Muhammad's knife was poised at his throat, he realized that Islam was true after all and rejoined the fold." (Sirat RasulAllah)

It is recorded in the sirat of Ibn Hisham: "RasulAllah had instructed his commanders when they entered Mecca only to fight those who resisted them except a small number who were to be killed even if they were found beneath the curtains of the Ka'ba. Among them was Abdullah b. Sa'd, brother of the Amir b. Lu'ayy. The reason he ordered him to be killed was that he had been a Muslim and used to write down revelation; then he apostatized and returned to Quraysh and fled to Uthman b. Affan whose foster brother he was. The latter hid him until he brought him to the apostle after the situation in Mecca was tranquil, and asked that he might be granted immunity. They allege that the apostle remained silent for a long time till finally he said yes, (granting Abdullah immunity from the execution order). When Uthman had left he (saw) said to his companions who were sitting around him, "I kept silent so that one of you might get up and strike off his head!" One of the Ansar said, then why didn't you give me a sign, O RasulAllah?" He (saw) answered that a prophet does not kill by pointing." (Sirat RasulAllah)

al-'Iraqi wrote: "The scribes of Muhammad were 42 in number. Abdallah Ibn Sarh al-Amiri was one of them, and he was the first Quraishite among those who wrote in Mecca before he turned away from Islam. He started saying, "I used to direct Muhammad wherever I willed. He would dictate to me 'Most High, All-Wise', and I would write down 'All-Wise' only. Then he would say, 'Yes it is all the same'. On a certain occasion he said, 'Write such and such', but I wrote 'Write' only, and he said, 'Write whatever you like.'" So when this scribe exposed Muhammad, he wrote in the Qur'an, "And who does greater evil than he who forges against Allah a lie, or says, 'To me it has been revealed', when naught has been revealed to him." So on the day Muhammad conquered Mecca, he commanded his scribe to be killed. But the scribe fled to Uthman Ibn Affan, because Uthman was his foster brother (his mother suckled Uthman). Uthman, therefore, kept him away from him (saw). After the people calmed down, Uthman brought the scribe to RasulAllah and sought protection for him. RasulAllah kept silent for a long time, after which he said yes. When Uthman had left, RasulAllah said "I only kept silent so that you (the people) should kill him." (Al-Sira)

Aisha (raa) narrates: "On the occasion of the battle of Uhud (when the Muslims suffered defeat), a woman apostatized. To this RasulAllah (saw) responded: Let her repent. If she does not repent, she should be executed." (Bayhaqi)

It is narrated from Jabir ibn Abdullah that: "A woman Umm Ruman (or Umm Marwan) apostatized. Then RasulAllah ordered that it would be better that she be offered Islam again and then repent. Otherwise she should be executed." (Daraqutni; Bayhaqi)

In another narration it is stated that: "She refused to accept Islam. Therefore she was executed." (Bayhaqi)

The general meaning of ahadith regarding the matter indicates that it is essential to put murtad to death whether he is 'muharib' (waging war on Islam) or not. And it is clear in the ahadith that RasulAllah (saw) command to put the murtad death due to his irtidad and not his waging against Islam. No doubt some types of irtidad are more detestable when we compare with other types of irtidad and moreover if murtad wages war against Islam then his situation and punishment would be harsher than some other murtads. There is an ikhtilaaf among the ulamaa regarding to whether asking the muharib murtad to repent or not; whether accept his repentance or not.

Waging war against Islam is not limited only to fighting with weapons; rather it may be done verbally such as defaming Islam or RasulAllah (saw), or attacking the Qur'an, and so on. Waging verbal war against Islam may be worse than waging war against it with weapons in some cases. Ibn Taymiyyah said: "Muharabah (waging war against Islam) is of two types: physical and verbal. Waging war verbally against Islam may be worse than waging war physically hence RasulAllah (saw) used to kill those who waged war against Islam verbally, whilst letting off some of those who waged war against Islam physically. This ruling is to be applied more strictly after the death of RasulAllah (saw). Mischief may be caused by physical action or by words, but the damage caused by words is many times greater than that caused by physical action; and the goodness achieved by words in reforming may be many times greater than that achieved by physical action. It is proven that waging war against Allah and His Messenger (saw) verbally is worse and the effort on earth to undermine religion by verbal means is more effective." (al-Sarim al-Maslool, 3/735)

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) says if the muharib murtad repentances his repentance would not be accepted on the contrary he would be put to death and with the opposition of this, if the murtad who is not muharib repentances his tawba would be accepted: "Irtidad is of two types: ordinary irtidad and extreme irtidad, for which execution is prescribed. In both cases there is evidence that it is essential to execute murtad, but the evidence indicating that the sentence of death may be waived if the person repents does not apply to both types of irtidad. Rather the evidence indicates that that is allowed only in the first case (i.e., ordinary irtidad) as will be clear to anyone who studies the evidence that speaks about accepting the repentance of the murtad. In the second type (i.e., extreme irtidad) the obligation to put the murtad to death still stands, and there is no text or scholarly consensus to indicate that the death sentence may be waived. The two cases are quite different and there is no comparison between them. It does not say in the Qur'an or Sunnah, or according to scholarly consensus, that everyone who makes irtidad in word or deed may be spared the death sentence if he repents after he is a captured and tried. Rather the Qur'an and Sunnah, and scholarly consensus, differentiate between the different kinds of irtidad." (al-Saarim al-Maslool, 3/696)

Ibn Taymiyyah said: "It is well known that the kafir Tatars are better than Batinis, because the latter are murtads from Islam, of the worst type of irtidad. Murtad is worse than one who is a kafir in the first place in many aspects." (Majmu al-Fatawa, 1/193) Hallaj is an example of the extreme irtidad and he was one of the most well known zindeeq who were put to death without being asked to repent. Qadi Iyad (ra) said: "The Maliki fuqaha of Baghdad at the time of al-Muqtadir were unanimously agreed that Hallaj should be killed and crucified because of his claim to divinity and his belief in incarnation, and his saying "I am al-Haqq (God)" even though he outwardly appeared to adhere to sharee'ah, and they did not accept his repentance." (Al Shifa bi Ta'rif Huqooq al-Mustafa, 2/1091)

It is narrated from Ayyub from Ikrimah who said: "The heretics were brought to Ali (ra) and he executed them by fire and this news reached Ibn Abbas who said: 'If it was me I wouldn't have executed them by fire due to the forbiddance of doing this by RasulAllah (saw): Do not punish with what Allah punishes with (i.e. fire). I would have executed them on account of what RasulAllah said when he stated whoever changes his religion – kill him (i.e. execute)'." (Bukhari, 'Kitaab Istataabat ul-Murtaddeen wa'l-Mu'aaniddeen wa Qitaalahum' Dealing with the Apostates and Those who Stubbornly Hate Islam and Confronting Them; Imam Shafii, al-Umm 'al-Murtaddeen 'an il-Islam' Those who Apostate from Islam, 1/257; al-Humaydi, Musnad; Abu Dawud, Kitaab ul-Hudood, 'the ruling of those who apostatize'; Nasai, 'on the ruling of the apostate, # 4059; Tirmidhi, 'What has Arrived Regarding the Murtad'; Ibn Majah)

After relating this hadith; Imam Shafii discusses the ruling upon the murtad and says that murtad is to be executed after making repentance and he mentioned the relevant verses and ahadith about irtidad and the murtad. (Al-Umm, 1/257) Tirmidhi reported this hadith from another chain from Ikrimah and then commented the hadith: "It is Hasan Sahih and the Ahlu'l-Ilm acted on this in regards to the Murtad and they differed in regards to the woman who apostatizes from Islam. A group of Ahlu'l-Ilm said: she is to be executed and this was the view of Imams Awzai, Ahmad and Ishaq bin Rahawayh. Another group of Ahlu'l-Ilm said: she is to be imprisoned and not executed and this was the views of the Imam Sufyan ath-Thawri and others from the people of Kufah."

It is reported from Ibn Mas'ud (ra): "The blood of a Muslim person who bears witness that there is no god worthy of worship except Allah and that I am RasulAllah is not permitted to shed except in three instances: for committing the crime of murder (killing a soul); committing adultery and for abandoning his deen and leaving the Jama'ah." (Bukhari in Kitaab ud-Diyaat (Book of Blood Money) in the chapter 'the saying of Allah an-Nafs bi'n-Nafsin wa'l-'Aynu bi'l-'Ayn' (a soul for a soul and an eye for an eye)

Narrated from Abdullah Ibn Mas'ud (ra) said that RasulAllah (saw) said: "The blood of a Muslim person is not permissible to shed." (Muslim, 'Maa yubaah bihi Damm ul-Muslim'; Nasai, sunnan, 'Kitaab ul-Tahreem id-Damm' (Book of the Prohibition of Shedding Blood), 'Ma yahill bihi Damm il-Muslim'; Tirmidhi, Blood money, 'What has arrived regarding the blood of a Muslim person which is not permissible to shed except in three instances')

Narrated from A'ishah (raa) said: "From what I know RasulAllah (saw) said; "The blood of a Muslim

person is not permissible to shed except a man who is an adulterer after he has preserved himself (from zina), or commits disbelief after his Islam or (when taking) a soul for a soul.” (Bukhari; Nasai, ‘Kitabul Qasamati wal Qawadi Waddiyati, Babu Suqutil Qawadi Minal Muslimi lil Kafiri’)

Narrated from Uthman (ra) that he said: “I heard RasulAllah say ‘The blood of a Muslim person is not permissible to shed except a man who commits disbelief after his Islam or is an adulterer after he has preserved himself (from zina), or (when taking) a soul for a soul.’ By Allah I have not committed zinaa neither during Jahiliyyah nor in Islam; I have not changed my deen since Allah guided me and I have not killed a soul.” (Bukhari)

Narrated from Abu Musa who said: “I came to RasulAllah (saw) along with two men (from the tribe) of Ash’ariyeen, one on my right and the other on my left, while RasulAllah was brushing his teeth (with a siwaak), and both men asked him for some employment. RasulAllah (saw), said, ‘O Aba Musa (or O Abdullah bin Qays!).’ I said, ‘By Him Who sent you with the Truth, these two men did not tell me what was in their hearts and I did not feel (realize) that they were seeking employment.’ As if I were looking now at his Siwaak being drawn to a corner under his lips, and he said, ‘We never (or, we do not) appoint for our affairs anyone who seeks to be employed. But O Abu Musa! (or Abdullah bin Qays!) Go to Yemen.’ RasulAllah (saw) then sent Mu’adh bin Jabal after him and when Mu’adh reached him, he spread out a cushion for him and requested him to get down (and sit on the cushion). There was a fettered man beside Abu Musa. Mu’adh asked, ‘Who is this (man)?’ Abu Musa said, ‘He was a Jewish and became a Muslim and then reverted back to the deen of the yahood.’ Then Abu Musa requested Mu’adh to sit down but Mu’adh said, ‘I will not sit down till he has been executed. This is the judgment of Allah and His Messenger and repeated it thrice. Then Abu Musa ordered that the man be killed’...” (Bukhari, ‘Kitaab Istitaabat ul-Murtaddeen’ Dealing with the Apostates, Muslim, Kitaab ul-Imarah)

"Abu Qilabata narrates: “One day Umar bin Abdulaziz held an open court, and called the people to see him. They started coming to him... He asked my opinion regarding one case. I swore to God and said that RasulAllah (saw) did not allow killing of any one with the exception of the following three criminals: One who kills another human being out of his personal passions. Second, the one who is married and yet commits adultery. Third, the one who becomes an apostate and engages in a war against Allah and His Messenger (saw). On hearing that the people said: Is it not narrated by Anas (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) punished the thieves by cutting their hands, putting red-hot needles in their eyes, and then throwing their bodies in the sun to rot? On hearing that, I said to them, ‘Let me tell you Anas’ narration as Anas (ra) had told me himself: ‘Eight men of ‘Ukl tribe came to see RasulAllah (saw) and accepted Islam by making bi’at at his hand. But the climate of madinah did not suite them and they got ill and became very weak. They complained about their health to RasulAllah (saw), and he told them that they should go out with his shepherd and live in the open in the meadows for his camels, and they may use the milk and urine of the camels as a treatment for their illness. They agreed and went out to live at the meadows. They used the milk and urine of the camels and their health was recovered. Then, they killed the shepherd of RasulAllah (saw) and ran away with the camels. When RasulAllah (saw) came to know about it, he sent men to catch them. They were caught and brought in front of him. He ordered that they should be punished for their crimes. Their hands and feet were cut, red-hot needles were pierced in

their eyes and they were left in the sun to die! I say can there be any crime as monstrous as they had committed and were punished for! They had committed a murder and theft after their apostasy!" (Bukhari, Kitabud Diyati, Babul Qasamati)

Al-Mundhiri stated: "Ahl ul-'ilm have agreed that two witnesses have to be present for an irtidad case to be accepted and murtad is executed with the presence of two witnesses, if he doesn't return back to Islam. Only al-Hasan (al-Basri) stated that there has to be four witnesses with regards to irtidad, but he agrees with them (that murtad should be executed) and only differs in regards to the number of witnesses." (Kitabu'l-Ijma, babu'l-Murtad, 186)

Imam Muwaffaquddeen Ibn Qudamah al-Maqdisi al-Hanbali said: "Murtad: the one who goes back on Islam and converts back to kufr, Allah says, "And they will continue to fight you until they turn you back from your religion if they are able. And whoever of you reverts from his religion (to disbelief) and dies while he is a disbeliever for those, their deeds have become worthless in this world and the Hereafter, and those are the companions of the Fire, they will abide therein eternally." (al-Baqarah 2/217) And RasulAllah (saw) said: "Whoever changes his religion – kill him (i.e. execute)." The people of knowledge have agreed on the obligation of executing murtad and this is relayed from Abu Bakr (ra), Uthman (ra), Ali (ra), Mu'adh (ra), Abu Musa (ra), Ibn Abbas (ra), Khalid (ra) and other Sahabah. This is not denied by anyone and was the consensus." (Al Mughni, Kitabu'l-Murtad, 12/264)

Ibn Rushd stated: "Murtad, if he is caught before he escapes, is according to broad agreement, to be executed due to the saying of RasulAllah (saw): 'Whoever changes his religion – kill him (i.e. execute).'

The scholars differed over executing the woman and if her repentance is accepted or not and jumhur (majority) of the scholars said: she is to be executed. Abu Hanifahh (ra) said she is not to be executed and he compared her to a female disbeliever (in her original condition of kufr), but the majority depend on the general understanding that has been relayed in this issue. An odd view was also stated which is that she is executed even if she goes back to Islam." (Bidaayat ul-Mujtahid 2/459)

Muhammad Husayn al-Aqabi relays the ijma on the execution of the apostate: "If a free woman or a slave woman apostates then she has to be executed. Then he mentioned the difference of opinion over the execution of a woman and says that the most correct opinion is that she be executed." (Takmilat ul-Majmu' li'n-Nawawi fi'l-Madhdhab ish-Shafii, 18/10)

The hadd punishment for irtidad can only be implemented by governor or his deputy. (Fayz-ul-ilah, 2/305; Ibn Najjar, Muntaha'l-Iradat, 2/499; Ibn Qudamah, al-Kafi, 3/161) "He will not be washed, his salah will not be performed, he will not be buried with the Muslimeen because he is kafir, and respect will not be shown to him." (Hisnî Kifâyat-ul-Ahyar 2/204; Al-Mabsut 10/109-110; Fath-il Qadir 4/388-389; Al-Mugni 2/230) However if the murtad is a delegate of the kuffar he will not be killed. The reason is RasulAllah (saw) did not kill the delegate of Musaylimah. (Ibn Qudamah, Al-Kafi, 3/161; Ibn Muflih, Al-Furu, 2/159; Ibn Najjar, Muntahal Iradat, 2/305) **3- Female apostate**

The shafii (Imam Shafii, al Umm, 6/148-149; Sabbag, Ash-Shamil, 6/100; Firuzabadi, Al-Muhazzab, 2/223)

the Hanbali (Ibn-i Qudamah, Al-Kafi, 3/57; Ibn-i Dawyan, Manar us Sabil, 2/404) the Maliki (Sharh u Minah il Jalil 4/466; Shar-ul-Hurashi S/65) carry the view that as long as she does not make tawbah the murtad female will be killed. The Maliki claim the female must be cleansed from her menstration. If she is breast feeding she will not be killed until another female who can breastfedd the child is found. According to the Hanafi the murtad female will not be killed if she does not perform tawbah she will be imprisoned and beaten until she makes tawbah. If she is one of the leading females among the kuffar a warrior and an arbiter she will be killed. (Al Mabsut 10/110; Ibn Hamam Fath-il Qadir 4/388-389; Marginani Al-Hidaya 2/122) "Until she gives birth a pregnant female will not be killed. Later she will be killed if she does not make tawbah." (Al Umm, 6/149; Al-Ikna, 4/302; Umdat ul Kari Sharh-ul Buhari 24/77; irshad us Sari 10/77) The Hanafi faqih will be imprisoned until they make tawbah. (Al Mabsut, 142-144; Lataif ul isharat, 136; Badaius Sanai, 7/135; Al Hidaya, 2/122; Sarahsi, Al-Mabsut, 10/108; Tuhfet-ul-Fuqaha, 4/530)

"A blind man had a freed concubine (Umm walad) who used to insult RasulAllah (saw) and say bad things about him. He told her not to do that but she did not stop, and he rebuked her but she did not heed him. One night, when she started to say bad things about RasulAllah (saw) and insult him, he took a short sword or dagger, put it on her belly and pressed it and killed her. A child fell between her legs, and became covered by blood. The following morning that was mentioned to RasulAllah (saw). He called the people together and said, "I ask by Allah the man who has done this action and I order him by my right over him that he should stand up." The blind man stood up and said, "O RasulAllah (saw), I am the one who did it; she used to insult you and say bad things about you. I forbade her, but she did not stop, and I rebuked her, but she did not give up her habit. I have two sons like pearls from her, and she was kind to me. Last night she began to insult you and say bad things about you. So I took a dagger, put it on her belly and pressed it till I killed her." Thereupon RasulAllah (saw) said: "Bear witness, there is no blood money due for her." (Nasai; Abu Dawud; Ibn Sa'd, al-Tabaqaat al-Kubra 4/210)

Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said: "This is indicated by the words of Imam Ahmad, because it was said to him concerning the report of Abdullah: Are there any ahadith about the execution of the dhimmi if he reviles (RasulAllah)? He said: Yes, such as the hadith about the blind man who killed the woman. He said: He heard her reviling RasulAllah (saw) and Abdullah narrated these two hadith from him. This is supported by the fact that for there to have been two blind men who were both treated kindly by two women who both repeated slurs against RasulAllah (saw), each one of whom was killed by the blind man acting alone and in both cases RasulAllah (saw) adjured the person responsible to come forward, is something very unlikely." (al-Saarim al-Maslool 72-73)

Tirmidhi reported from Ikrimah that RasulAllah (saw) said: "whoever changes his religion – kill him (i.e. execute)" and then commented the hadith: "It is Hasan Sahih and the Ahlu'l-'Im acted on this in regards to the Murtad and they differed in regards to the woman who apostatizes from Islam. A group of Ahlu'l-'ilm said: she is to be executed and this was the view of Imams Awzai, Ahmad and Ishaq bin Rahawayh. Another group of Ahlu'l-'ilm said: she is to be imprisoned and not executed and this was the views of the Imam Sufyan ath-Thawri and others from the people of Kufah." (Tirmidhi)

"It is reported that Ibni 'Abbas Said: 'The female apostate should be imprisoned and should not be killed'." (sunnan ad-Darakutni, Kitabul Hududi Wad Diyati Wa Ghairha, 3/118 #120)

Marghinani said: "The reasons for not killing a female apostate are two-fold: One, RasulAllah (saw) prohibited the killing of women; and second, in essence this particular punishment requires that it may be left for the Day of Judgment. A person needs time to be tested. Killing a person hurriedly takes away that chance. Adopting this principle of justice helps prevent a trial—the trial related to war! (The chances are that she will not go back and join the ranks of enemy war machine.) As women by nature are not inclined to wage war like men, therefore, their killing is prohibited." (al-Hidayah Sharhu Bidayatul Muhtadi, 2/406-407)

Imam Ibnul Humam writes in his book Fathul Qadir: "The reason to kill an apostate is only with the intent to eliminate the danger of war, and not for the reason of his disbelief. The punishment of disbelief is far greater with Allah. Therefore, only such an apostate shall be killed who is actively engaged in war; and usually it is a man, and not a woman. For the same reason, RasulAllah (saw) has forbidden to kill women. And for this very reason, an apostate female could be killed if she in fact instigates and causes war by her influence and armed force at her disposal. She is not killed because of her apostasy, but for her creating disorder (through war) on earth." (Sharhu Fathil Qadir, 5/311)

Sarahsi said: 'To disbelieve is no doubt a very grave sin, but it is a matter between Allah and His servant. Hence, its punishment shall be in the life hereafter. The corporal punishments that are given in this world are ordained to protect the rights of other human beings, such as the punishment of "qisas" (the law of retaliation for murder or physical injuries) is to protect life; punishment for "Zina" (adultery & fornication) is to protect family lineage; punishment for "Sirqa" (theft) is to protect the property of others; punishment of "Qadhaf" (defamation) is to protect honor and reputation of others; and punishment for "Khumr" (use of intoxicants) is to protect mental health in society. When a person who insists on "kufr" is engaged in armed struggle against Muslims, to protect the Muslims from the evil consequences of war, he is killed. At places, Allah has clearly stated the immediate cause of protection from the evil effects of the war. For example, He says: "But if they attack you, then kill them." (al-Baqarah 2/192) And at other places, He gives the reason (of Shirk) that leads them to war. Thus, on the one hand it is established that the reason to kill is armed conflict, and on the other hand it is known that woman is not by nature capable of waging armed attacks; therefore, she is killed neither for her disbelief, nor for her apostasy.' (Kitabu'l-Mabsut, 9/110) **4- The child or insane person is not executed for apostasy because they are exempted**

There is unanimity that the male apostate must be put to death, but only if he is grown up (baligh) and compos mentis ('akil) and has not acted under compulsion (mukhtar). RasulAllah (saw) said; "The pen is lifted from three: the child until he matures the sleeping person until he awakes and the mad person until he comes to his senses." (Ahmad; Abu Dawud; Ibn Hibban; Hakim graded it as sahih)

The child

The irtidad of a mumayyiz child is sahih according to Abu Hanifah, Imam Muhammad, Imam Malik and Imam Ahmad. (Kasani, Badaius Sanai, 7/135; Sarahsi, Al Mabsut 10/122; Ibn Abidin 4/257; Ibn Qudamah Al-Mughni 4/15; Hashiyat at-Dasuki 4/361; Kashshaf-il Kinagh 6/168) The dhahir narration from the madhhab of Imam Malik and the known from Imam Ahmad (Ibn Qudamah, Al Mughni) their understanding is this also, Imam Shaafi (Ibn Hubayra, Al iyzah wa't Tabyin; Hashiyat ul Bayjuri 2/264; Ibn Hajar al Haysami 9/93; Asn al Matalib 4/12; AL Mabsut 10/120; Fat il Qadir 14/104) had come to an understanding that the irtidad of a child is not sahih. A riwaya in this sense had been made by Imam Ahmad (AL Ba'li, Kashffi'l Masail 18; Ibn Qudamah Al Mughni 5/551). Abu Yusuf from the Hanafi states the irtidad of the child is not sahih (Sarahsî, Al Mabsut 10/122; Al-bahr-ir Raik 5/150; Badaus Sanai 3/143; Ibn Qudamah Al-Mughni, 9/16) "Until he reaches puberty and 3 days pass from the day he reaches puberty he will not be killed. If he continues upon his kufr then he will be killed." (Ibn Qudamah, El-Mughnî 8/551; Ibnu Dawyan Manaru's- Sibil 2/407; Mardawii Al-Insaf, 10/320, Muhammad, Al Mabsut, 144, Sarahsi Al Mabsut 10/122; Samarqandi, Tuhfetu'l-Fukaha 4/530 Kasani, Bedaiu's-Sana'i, 7/135; Marginani, El-Hidaya, 2/126)

The intoxicated (drunk)

"The individual who performs irtidad intoxicated until he sobers up and until 3 days pass from his irtidad he will not be killed. If he dies at the time of his irtidad it will be given the hukm that he dies as a kafir." (Ibn u Kudama, Al Mughni, 8/563) The narrations from Imam Ahmad are diverse. (Mardawi, Al Insaf, 10/331) In a narration the irtidad of the intoxicated is pointed out to be sahih. Abu'lHattab stated: The most dhahir narration of the two is this. At the same time this is the madhhab of Imam Shaafi. (Imam Shaafi, Al Umm, 6/148; Sabbagh, Ash Shamil, 6/102, Omar Barakat, Fayzu'l Ilah, 2/305; Kalyubi and Umayra, 4/176) In another narration from Imam Ahmad it is not sahih. (Fiyruz Abada Al Muhazzab, 2/222; Kalyubî ve Umayra, 4/176) The view of Abu Hanifah was also that it is not sahih. (Samarqandi, Tubfatu'l-Fukaha, 4/532, Kasani, Badaiu's-Sana'i, 7/134; Sarahsi Al Mabsut, 10/123) According to the Maliki if the intoxicated drinks knowing alcohol is haraam and if he performs irtidad while intoxicated his irtidad is valid. However if he drinks not knowing it is haraam than his irtidad is invalid. (Al Insaf 10/331-332; Mughnil Muhtaj 4/137; Hashiyatul-Dasuki 4/363; Ibn Qudamah el-Mughni 9/25-26)

Ikhtiyar

All four madhhab had made ittifaq that under coercion the individual who utters a word of kufr does not become kafir, however in a situation of oppression other than coercion the individual who utters kufr even if he claims his heart is full of iman he still becomes kafir. (Badai-us sanaigh 9/4483; Esh Sharh us-saghir 2/548-54; Esh sharhul Kabeer 10/109; Sarahsi Al Mabsut 10/123; Imam Shafii Al Umm 6/152) Ibn Qudamah: "An individual who utters word of kufr under coercion will not become kafir." (Al Mughni, 8/561; Makdisi, Al-Ikna, 4/306; Imam Ahmad, Al Bahru'l-Zahhar, 5/424) Imam Malik (Alish Minahu'l-Jalil Sharhi, 4/470) Imam Abu Hanifah (As Sarahsi, Al Mabsut, 10/123) and Imam Shaafi (Al Mabsut, 6/152; Sabbagh, Al Shamil, 6/148) carry the view that he will not become kafir. Other than Imam Muhammad among the Hanafi all the imams state if a Muslim makes irtidad under coercion he will not be killed. According to the Hanafi he will be imprisoned. According to Imam Muhammad among the Hanafi he will

be killed. (Badaius Sanai 9/4484-4486; Ibn Qudamah al Mughni Sharh il Kabeer 10/107; Al-Fatawa ul Hindiyya 2/257; Sarahsi Al Mabsut 10/123; Alish, the sharh of Minahul Jalil 4/470)

The insane

The irtidad and the Islam of all individuals who are insane or given the hukm insane is not sahih. (Kashani, Bedarai-Sana'i 7/134; Makdisi Al Ikna 4/301; Ibnu Qudamah Al Kafi 3/155; FiyruzAbadi Al Muhazzab 2/222; Imam Shaafi, Al Umm 6/148; Sabbagh Ash Shamil 6/120; Kalyubi ve Umayra 4/176; Omar Barakat Fayzu'l ilâh 2/305) The one who kills the insane who has performed irtidad is a murderer and his punishment is retaliation. "The punishment of the murderer who kills the one who performs irtidad while he is insane is retaliation." (Makdisi Al Ikna 4/301) "The irtidad of the individual who is sane sometimes and insane other times is not sahih if he performs irtidad while he is insane. However if he performs irtidad while he is sane it is sahih. The reason for this is that the convert insane is in one state and not in the other (he is not both sane and insane at the same time)." (Al Kasani, Badaius-Sana'i, 7 /134; Badai-us Sana'i 7/134, Al bahr ur Raik 5/129; Ibn Qudamah al-Mughni 10/129; Makdisi al Ikna 4/301; Nihayatul Muhtaj, 3907; Imam Shaafi, al Umm 6/148) **5- Repentance of the Murtad**

According to a view of the Maliki, Imam Muhammad from the Hanafi and Imam Abu Yusuf, the Shaafi and the Hanbali it is necessary to call the murtad to make tawbah prior to killing him. (Fath il Qadir 4/385; Al Mabsut 10/98; Al Bahrur Raik 5/135; Al Hurashi Hashiyet ull Hurasi 8/65; Mawahib-ul Jaul 6/281; Ibn Qudamah Al Mughni 9/4; Nawawi al Majmugh 18/11; Nihayat il Muhtaj 7/399)

It is narrated from Zayd ibn Aslam that RasulAllah (saw) declared: 'Whoever changes his religion should be executed.' Malik said about this tradition: As far as we can understand this command of the prophet means that the person who leaves Islam to follow another way, but conceals his kufr and continues to manifest Islamic belief, as is the pattern of the Zindiqs and others like them, should be executed after his guilt has been established. He should not be asked to repent because the repentance of such persons cannot be trusted. But the person who has left Islam and publicly chooses to follow another way should be requested to repent. If he repents, good, otherwise, he should be executed. (Muwatta, Bab al-Qada' fi Man Artadda 'an al-Islam)

In the opinion of Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal any adult and rational man or woman who renounces Islam and chooses kufr should be given a three day period to repent. The person who does not repent should be executed. This is also the opinion of Hasan Basri, Zuhri, Ibrahim Nakhi, Makhul, Hammad, Malik, Layth, Awzai, Shafi'i and Ishaq ibn Rahwiyah. (al-Mughni 10/74)

Imam Tahawi stated: "The fuqaha differ among themselves concerning whether or not the person who has apostatized from Islam should be requested to repent. One group says it is much better that the imam requests the apostate to repent. If he repents, he should be released. Otherwise he should be executed. Imam Abu Hanifah, Abu Yusuf and Muhammad are among those who have expressed this opinion. A second group says there is no need to request repentance. For them the condition of the apostate resembles that of the harbi kafir (the infidel at war). The infidels at war whom our invitation

has already reached need not be invited to Islam before initiating war against them. Nevertheless every effort should be made to fully inform all others who have not been previously invited to repent, before attacking them. Likewise every effort should be made to bring back to Islam the person who has apostatized for lack of information about Islam. But the person, who understands Islam well and deliberately renounces Islam, should be executed without any invitation to repentance. This opinion is supported by a statement of Imam Abu Yusuf also who writes in his book al-Amla: I will execute an apostate and will not ask for repentance. If, however, he hastens to repent, I will leave him and commit his affair to Allah.” (Sharh Ma'ani al-Athar)

When any person forsakes Islam -refuge is in Allah- then Islam should be presented to him. If he has any doubt, every effort should be made to clear it. For it is highly possible that he is afflicted by some doubt, which, if removed, will avert his evil prospect of death by the better prospect of re-embracing Islam. But according to the leading lawyers it is not necessary to offer him Islam because he has already received its invitation. (Hidayah, Bab Ahkam al-Murtaddin)

It is recorded from Shafi'i that it is incumbent upon the imam to grant the apostate a three day respite. It is illegal for him to execute him before the respite expires, since the apostasy of a Muslim could be the result of some form of doubt. Thus there must be some time given him as an opportunity for consideration and reflection. We consider three days to be sufficient for this purpose. (Hidayah)

Imam Abu Hanifah says: “It is not necessary he be called to tawbah. He will be killed that instant. However if he requests time, he will be given 3 days.” (Samarqandi, Tuhfat-ul-Fuqaha, 3/530; Kashani, Badaius Sanai, 7/134 Marghinani, Al Hidayah, 2/122; Ibn Israil, Lataif ul isharat, 136; Kurtubi, Tafsir ul Jami, 3/47) From among the asbab of Abu Hanifah according to those who say time will be given, even if they don't request it, it is best to give time.” (Marghinani, Al Hidayah, 2/122; Sarahsi, al Mabsut, 10/98) Imam Malik states: It is necessary to invite to tawbah. If he makes tawbah at that instant his tawbah will be accepted. If he does not make tawbah he will be given three days time with the hope that he will make tawbah. If he still does not make tawbah he will be killed.” (Sharhu Hurashi, 8/65 Alish, Sharhu Minah il Jalil, 4/465; Bahram, Ash Shamil 2/17; Qurtubi, Tafsir, 3/47) “Imam Shaafi has 2 views regarding the necessity of calling for tawbah. The most popular one is the necessity of calling to tawbah. Again Imam Shaafi has two views regarding giving time. The most popular one is not to give time even if he requests it, on the contrary he be killed in the event that he insists on in being murtad.” (Shaafi, Al Umm, 6/32; Firuzabadi, Al Muhazzab, 2/223) There is two narrations from Imam Ahmad: “One is like the view of Imam Malik. According to the second one calling to awbah is not necessary. When it comes to giving time his madhhab is in ikhtilaf in regards to giving 3 days time.” (Mardawl, Al Insaf, 10/328 Hidayat ur Raghib, 538; Kalwazani, Al Hidayah, 202; Ibn Dawyan, Muntahai Iradat, 2/405) It had been narrated from Hasan Basri that the murtad will not be called to tawbah and it is necessary to kill him. (Ash Sharail: Sabbagh; 6/100) In his tafsir Qurtubi had narrated from Hasan that the murtad will be called to tawbah 100 times (Qurtubi 3/47). Ata states: If he had been born Muslim and later has left Islam he will not be called to tawbah. If he became Muslim while kafir than later has left Islam he will be called to tawbah. (Sabbagh, Ash Shamil, 6/100)

Nawawi (ra) said: "The repentance of the kafir from his kufr is definitely accepted, but is any other kind of repentance definitely accepted or likely to be accepted? There is a difference of opinion among Ahl al-Sunnah concerning that, and Imam al-Haramayn was of the view that it is likely, and this is the more correct view. And Allah knows best." (Sharh Muslim) Iraqi stated: "Repentance expiates for major sins, and there is consensus on that. But is its expiation definite or likely? With regard to repentance from kufr, it is definite, but with regard to other major sins, the scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah disagreed. Al-Nawawi said: The strongest view is that it is likely. The Mu'tazilah were of the view that repentance should be accepted on the basis of reason (as it was their way to refer everything to reason). Abu'l-Abbas al-Qurtubi said: What I say is that the one who studies shari'ah on the basis of Qur'an and Sunnah, and follows what is in them with regard this topic knows for certain that Allah accepts the repentance of those who are sincere." (Tarh al-Tathreeb 8/40)

Ibn Ashoor said: "The scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah fall into two groups: One group is of the view that repentance is definitely accepted because there are reports to support that. The large number of reports indicates that this is definitive." (al-Tahreer wa'l-Tanweer 1/914)

Regarding the evidence of the murtad not being invited to tawbah Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "The reason is the Prophet (saw) had commanded the one who changes his deen, the one who leaves his deen, the one who leaves the jamaa'ah to be killed. He did not command the request of tawbah from the murtad. Allah ta'ala had also commanded to fight the mushrik without calling to make tawbah. However if they make tawbah we can not touch them. This confirms that the kufr of the murtad is much worse than the kafir. If it is permissible to kill the prisoner from the enemy the killing of the murtad will be permissible in precedence. Our view of seeing permissible of killing the kafir without inviting to tawbah is due to the fact that the risala of Muhammad (saw) may not have reached him. It is not permissible to kill an individual who has no news (note heard) of Islam. In the case of the murtad the call of Islam has reached. It is permissible to kill the individual which the call (of Islam) has reached like the kafir. This is the evidence of those who account tawbah as mustahab. Even if the call of Islam has reached them during war it is mustahab to call the kafir to Islam. It is like this with the murtad. It is not necessary to call the kafir and the murtad to tawbah. Yes if it is considered that the murtad does not know it is permissible to return to Islam in this case call to tawbah is imperative." (As-Sarim ul Maslul, 317)

Abu Barzah al-Aslami said: "A man spoke harshly to Abu Bakr al-Siddiq and I said, 'Shall I kill him?' He rebuked me and said, 'That is not for anyone insulted after RasulAllah (saw).'" (Nasa'i)

RasulAllah (saw) had the right to kill whoever insulted him and spoke harshly to him, and that included both Muslims and kafirs. The scholars are agreed that if a person insults RasulAllah (saw) and then repents sincerely and regrets what he has done, this repentance will benefit him on the Day of Resurrection and Allah will forgive him. But they differed as to whether his repentance should be accepted in this world and whether that means he is no longer subject to the sentence of execution. Malik and Ahmad were of the view that it should not be accepted, and that he should be killed even if he has repented. They relied on a hadith as an evidence from the Sunnah which is narrated that Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqaas said: "On the Day of the Conquest of Makkah, insulted RasulAllah (saw) granted safety to

the people except for four men and two women, and he named them, and Ibn Abi Sarh... As for Ibn Abi Sarh, he hid with Uthmaan ibn Affaan, and when insulted RasulAllah (saw) called the people to give their allegiance to him, he brought him to stand before insulted RasulAllah (saw). He said, "O insulted RasulAllah (saw), accept the allegiance of Abdullaah." He raised his head and looked at him three times, refusing him, then he accepted his allegiance after the third time. Then he turned to his companions and said: "Was there not among you any smart man who could have got up and killed this person when he saw me refusing to give him my hand and accept his allegiance?" They said, "We do not know what is in your heart, O insulted RasulAllah (saw). Why did you not gesture to us with your eyes?" He said, "It is not befitting for a Prophet to betray a person with a gesture of his eyes." (Abu Dawud) This clearly indicates that in a case such as this murtad who had insulted insulted RasulAllah (saw), it is not obligatory to accept his repentance; rather it is permissible to kill him even if he comes repentant. Abdullaah ibn Sa'd was one of those who used to write down the Revelation, then he apostatized and claimed that he used to add whatever he wanted to the Revelation. This was a lie and a fabrication against RasulAllah (saw), and it was a kind of insult. Then he became Muslim again and was a good Muslim, may Allah be pleased with him. (Al-Sarim 115)

"They said that insulting RasulAllah (saw) has to do with two rights, the right of Allah and the right of a human being. With regard to the right of Allah, this is obvious, because it is casting aspersions upon His Message, His Book and His Religion. As for the right of a human being, this is also obvious, because it is like trying to slander RasulAllah (saw) by this insult. In a case which involves both the rights of Allah and the rights of a human being, the rights of the human beings are not dropped when the person repents, as in the case of the punishment for banditry, because if the bandit has killed someone, it means that he must be executed and crucified. But if he repents before he is caught, then the right of Allah over him, that he should be executed and crucified, no longer applies, but the rights of other humans with regard to qisaas (retaliatory punishment) still stand. The same applies in this case. If the one who insulted RasulAllah (saw) repents, then the rights of Allah no longer apply, but there remains the right of RasulAllah (saw), which still stand despite his repentance. If it is said, "Can we not forgive him, because during his lifetime RasulAllah (saw) forgave many of those who had insulted him and he did not execute them?" The answer is: RasulAllah (saw) sometimes chose to forgive those who had insulted him, and sometimes he ordered that they should be executed, if that served a greater purpose. But now his forgiveness is impossible because he is dead, so the execution of the one who insults him remains the right of Allah, His Messenger and the believers, and the one who deserves to be executed cannot be let off, so the punishment must be carried out." (Al-Saarim al-Maslul, 2/438)

For the hikmah and for the good RasulAllah (saw) had forgiven many who had insulted him when Islam had first spread. (Qadi Iyad, Ash Shifa 2/474; Hashiyatu Raddi'l Muhtar 4/232-233; Al Bahr ur Raik 5/135; Mawahib ul Jalil 6/285-288; Al Hureshi 8/70,77; Subki, As Sayf ul Maslul 4; Muhyiddin, As Sayf ul Mashhur 2; Bahram, Ash Shamil 2/171 – Ibni Daywan, Manarus-sabil 2/409; Ibn Taymiyyah As Sarimul Maslul p22)

Regarding the matter of calling to tawbah in the era of the Hulafai Rashidin the views of the chaliphs differentiate. This difference in views has also occurred among the fuqaha. However the call to tawbah

seems necessary regardless of the condition. The reason is it is distant that an individual who has made iman will return to kufr a second time. However a doubt can enter his heart regarding a matter. If time is given and the doubt is rid it is greatly possible that the murtad makes tawbah. This will necessitate giving him sufficient time. Depending on the situation and the doubt of the murtad, the judge must designate the time. According to the evidence of narrations the time can not be less than three days.

Ibn Qudamah states: "The reform of a murtad is possible. It is not permissible to kill prior to working on his reform." (Mughni, 8/540) According to the view of the Maliki, the Hanafi, The Hanbali and the Shaafi the murtad will be called to tawbah for three days and if he does not make tawbah he will be killed. (Al Mabsut 10/98-99; Al Bahr ur Raik 5/135; Al Hurashi Hashiyat ul Hurashi 8/66; Mawahib ul Jalil 6/281) According to the other view of Imam Shaafi; the murtad will be called upon tawbah immediately. If he does not make tawbah he will be killed without waiting. (Nawawi Al Majmua, 18/12) Imam Sarahsi stated: "Only if the murtad requests time three day time will be given. It is understood that he has left Islam because a doubt has entered his heart. For this reason we will need to rid the doubt in his heart. Or he may need to think to comprehend that which is haqq. This can only occur by giving him some time. If he requests time the judge must give him time. Like the in the time given in muhayyar the time for thinking is 3 days. For this reason 3 days will be given for the murtad. More time than this will not be given. (Al Mabsut, 10/98-99)

"A person came to Umar ibn Hattab and Umar (ra) said to him: do you know of Maghriba? He said: yes a man who denied after belief. Umar: What did you do to him. The man: We caught him and chopped his neck. Umar: If only you had imprisoned him for 3 days and given him dry bread each day. Maybe he would have made tawbah and return to haqq. Than Umar lifted his hands and said: O Allah I did not witness this incident nor did I like what I heard. This hadith had been narrated through another chain. Umar (ra) said: If I were in your place I would have called him to make tawbah for three days. IF he did not make tawbah I'd kill him. This hadith is evidence that giving time is mustahab. (Ibn Hazm, Al Muhalla, 11/231) Ibn Hazm had presented the summary of the incident. In one part there is a call to tawbah three times in three days (Ibni Hazm, Al Muhalla, 11/230). In one part there is a call to tawbah only once (Ibni Hazm, El-Muhalla, 11/229). In another Chaliph Ali had called a murtad to tawbah for one month (Ibni Hazm, Al Muhalla, 11/230). The murtad had persisted in his stubbornness and Ali (ra) had killed him.

If there is a jamaa'ah which leaves Islam and if they request time; if their intention is not to divert the Muslim and gain time there is no inconvenience in giving them time. They may make tawbah before fighting. If their intention for requesting time is to prepare for war it is best not to give them time. All of this is left to the leader of the state. The reason is in this there is the benefit of the Muslim and the leader of state is the protector of these benefits. Imam Sarahsi states: "If they request time to think and if the Muslim will benefit from this and if the Muslim don't have the strength to face them (in battle) there is no harm in giving them time. The reason is they had left Islam due to a doubt which had entered their hearts. They may rid the doubt when they think." (Al Mabsut, 10/117)

According to the four madhhab the tawbah of the murtad will only be valid by him when he abandones

what he had denied. The utterance of sole shahadah would not be sufficient. However if he becomes murtad by leaving Islam in complete; if he says he rejects all deens other than Islam and utters the kalimat shahadah his tawbah will be valid. (Ibn Qudamah Al Mughni 10/100; Al Mabsut 10/112; Fath ul Qadir 4/387; Mardawi Al Insaf 1/335; Makdisi Al Iknagh 4/303; Nawawi Al Majmugh 18/13) Regarding this matter Ibn Qudamah states: "Whoever rejects something other than shahadah he will only enter Islam if he attests to rejecting that which he had rejected before a judge. If an individual attests the prophethood of Muhammad (saw) yet rejects that he had been sent to the entire world, he will not become (return) Muslim unless he attests that Muhammad is the prophet of the entire creation. Or along with shahadah as long as he is not distant from all other deen conflicting Islam, it will not be accepted that he is Muslim." (Al Mughni, 8/557)

Those whose tawbah is not accepted

Those who revile RasulAllah (saw) (Mardawi, al Insaf, 10/332; Ibn Qudamah, Al Kafi, 3/159; Ibni Najjar, Muntahal Iradat, 2/500; Ibni Dawyan, Manarus Sabil, 2/4090; Ibni Israil, As Sayf ul Mashhur, 1)

The zindeeq (Ibni Qudamah Al Kafi 3/159)

The Sorcerer. According to the Hanafi, the Hanbali and the Maliki the tawbah of the sorcerer and the zindeeq will not be accepted and they will be killed. According to the Shaafi the tawbah of the sorcerer and the zindeeq will be accepted (Hasiyat Ibn Abidin 232-233; Hashiyat ul Hurashi 8/70; Nihayat il Muhtaj 7/399; Ibn Qudamah Al Mughni 9/31; Hashishatit Dasuki 4/354; Nihayatil Muhtaj 7/399; Kashshaful Kinagh 6/177) If he does not perform sorcery for along time his tawbah will be accepted. (Badr Rashid, Ar Risala; Dimashki, Rahmatul Ummah Fihituaaf il Aamma, 267)

The one who performs continues Irtidad. According to the Hanafi, the Shaafi and the Maliki his second and third tawbah will be accepted. In the forth one he will be imprisoned until it is known that he has really made tawbah. (Fathil Qadir 4/387; Al Mabsut 10/99-100; Mawahib ul Jalil 6/282; Nawawi, Al Majmugh 18/13) Subki states: "This way he will be called upon permanent tawbah. Each return and leaving of Islam the Prophet had called Kayyan to tawbah 4 or 5 times. This is the view of Imam Shaafi and Imam Ahmad. Ibn Kayyim also states this. Imam Shaafi carries the view he will be killed the fourth time." (As Sayf il Maslul, 29) Imam Shaafi (Al Umm 6/147-148) and Sabbagh (Ag gamil 10/148) from among the Shaafi; Imam Muhammad (Al Mabsut, 144) from among the Hanafi narrate this. According to the Hanbali an individual who leaves Islam a few times and makes tawbah, his tawbah will not be accepted and will be killed. (Kashshaful kinagh 6/177; Ibn Qudamah Al Mughni 8/543; Ibn Qudamah, Al Kafi, 3/159; Muntahai Iradat 2/500; Hidayatur Raghib, 539; Ibn Dawvyan, Manarus Sabil, 2/409) **6- Some other Hukm related with the Murtad**

The marriage of the murtad:

When a Muslim leaves Islam while married his wife will be divorced from him with talaqi bain.

In this matter we do not come across any faqih who opposes this. The Hanafi (Muhammad, Al Mabsut, 332; Sarahsi, Al Mabsut, 5/4) the Shaafi (Imam Shaafi Al Umm, 6/149-150) the Hanbali (Ibn Qudamah, Al-Mughni, 7/99) and the Maliki (Karafi, Azzahira, 2/218) all share this view. If a Muslim leaves Islam and then gets married his marriage according to the fuqaha is not sahih because he is religionless. It is not permissible that a religionless individual be married neither to a Muslim or a kafir nor with another religionless person. The Hanafi (Sarahsi, Al Mabsut, 5/48; Muhammad, Mabsut, 142, 143, 313) the Shaafii (Shaafi, Al Umm, 5/51, 6/155; Sabbagh, Ashshamil, 5/102) the Hanbali (Ibn Qudamah, Al Mughni, 8/546) the Maliki (Karafi, Azzahira, 2/213) all share this view. Due to his deficiency. Imam Shaafi (Shaafi, Al Umm, 6/155) the Hanafi (Sarahsi, Al Mabsut, 5/48) and the Hanbali (Ibn Qudamah, Al Mughni, 8/546) all carry this view.

Returning the Property of the Murtad

If the murtad returns to Islam the fuqaha carry the same view that his property will be returned and that he is free in spending it, however there is ikhtilaf regarding the fact whether it is returned because the irtidad had been lifted (Al Hidayah, 2/122; Badaius-Sanai, 7/136; Al Insaf, 10/339; Al Ikna, 3/161; Al Umm, 6/151) or due to his right of re-attaining property (Kalwazani, Al Hidayah, 403; Ibn Muflih, Al Furu, 160). Some go further and say that even if the murtad makes tawbah that the property of the murtad will not be returned. (Bahram, Ash Shamil, 2/171; Sharhu Minai ilJalil, 4/469; Ibn Hazm, Al Muhalla, 9/371) Most scholars have accounted the property of the murtad is valid according to his blood. When the blood of the murtad is halaal he is banned from using his property. If he makes tawbah and returns to Islam the protection of his life will return. And it is also submitted that all of his property or the remaining portion be returned to him because the barrier –which is kufr- had been lifted.

7- Punishment of the Murtad

Execution should be by the sword. According to the traditions, apostates must sometimes have been tortured to death. The caliph Umar b Abdulaziz (ra) had them tied to a post and a lance thrust into their hearts. (Abu Yusuf, Kharaj, 112).

The hadd punishment for irtidad can only be implemented by governor or his deputy. (Fayz-ul-ilah, 2/305; Ibn-i Najjar, Muntaha'l-Iradat, 2/499; Ibn Qudamah, al-Kafi, 3/161)

Qurtubi said: "There is no dispute among the scholars that qisaas (retaliatory punishments) such as execution cannot be carried out except by those in authority who are obliged to carry out the qisaas and carry out hadd punishments etc, because Allah has addressed the command regarding qisaas to all the Muslims, and it is not possible for all the Muslims to get together to carry out the qisaas, which is why they appointed a leader who may represent them in carrying out the qisaas and hadd punishments." (Tafsir, 2/245, 246) Ibn Rushd said: "With regard to the one who should carry out this punishment – i.e., the hadd punishment for drinking alcohol – they agreed that the ruler should carry it out, and that applies to all the hadd punishments." (Bidaayat al-Mujtahid, 2/233) Shawkani said: "It was narrated

from Abu'l-Zinaad from his father that the fuqaha of the people of Madinah used to say that no one should carry out any of the hadd punishments except the ruler, unless it is a man carrying out the hadd punishment for zina on his male or female slave." (Nayl al-Awtaar, 7/295, 296)

Ibn Taymiyyah was asked about a married woman who had children and who formed an attachment to a man and committed immoral actions with him. When she was found out, she tried to leave her husband: did she have any right to her children after doing this? Was there any sin on them if they cut off relations with her? Was it permissible for the one who has proof of that to kill her secretly? If someone else did that would he be sinning? He replied: "Praise be to Allah. Her sons' and male relatives' duty is to prevent her from committing haraam actions, and if the only way they could do that is by detaining her, then they should detain her. If it means that they have to tie her up, then they should tie her up. But the son should not beat his mother, and with regard to treating her kindly, they have no right to do otherwise. It is not permissible for them to cut off ties with her so that she is free to do evil actions, rather they should try to prevent her from doing evil as much as possible. If she needs provision and clothing they should provide that for her. And it is not permissible for them to carry out the hadd punishment – execution or otherwise – on her, and they will be sinning if they do that." (Majmu' al-Fatawa, 34/177-178)

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) also said: "It remains to be said: The hudood punishment can only be carried out by the ruler or his deputy.

1 – The master may carry out the hadd punishment on his slave, based on the evidence that RasulAllah (saw) said: "Carry out the hadd punishments on those whom your right hands possess." (Ahmad and others) And he (saw) said: "If the slave woman of one of you commits zina, let him carry out the hadd punishment on her." (Abu Dawud; Bukhari; Muslim) I do not know of anyone among the fuqaha of hadith who disagreed with the view that he should carry out hadd punishments on her, such as the hadd punishments for zina, slander and drinking; there is no difference of opinion among the Muslims concerning the fact that he may carry out disciplinary punishments (ta'zir) on him. But they differed as to whether he may carry out punishments of execution or amputation on him, such as executing him for irtidat or for reviling RasulAllah (saw), or cutting off his hand for stealing. Two reports were narrated from Imam Ahmad concerning this. The first says that it is permissible, which is the view narrated from al-Shafi'i, and the second says that it is not permissible, like one of the two views of the companions of al-Shafi'i. This is also the view of Malik. And it was narrated in a sahih report from Ibn Umar (ra) that he cut off the hand of a slave of his who stole, and it is narrated in a sahih report from Hafsa that she executed a slave woman of hers who admitted to practising witchcraft, and that was based on the opinion of Ibn Umar. So the hadith is evidence for those who say that it is permissible for the master to carry out the hadd punishment on his slave on the basis of his knowledge, in all cases.

2 – The most that can be said about that is that he is transgressing the position of the ruler, and the ruler may pardon the one who carried out a hadd punishment that must be carried out without referring the matter to him.

3 – Although this was a hadd punishment, it also comes under the heading of killing a harbi (a non-Muslim in a state of war against Islam), and it is permissible for anyone to kill a harbi.

4 – Similar things happened at the time of RasulAllah (saw), such as the hypocrite who was killed by Umar (ra) without the permission of RasulAllah (saw), when the hypocrite did not agree with the ruling

of RasulAllah (saw). Then Qur'an was revealed approving Umar's action. And there was the daughter of Marwan who was killed by that man, and RasulAllah (saw) called him the supporter of Allah and His Messenger. That is because the one whose execution becomes necessary because of his plot to corrupt the religion is not like one who is executed because of his sin of zina and the like." (al-Saarim al-Maslool 285-286)

Irtidad usually is sourced from the mixing (of hukm) sourced from doubt and ignorance however ignorance and intention is not considered an excuse in irtidad. This is only a reason to call for tawbah and give some time. Sarahsi had said: "In our era the truth is clear in the open. After this not recognizing haqq, not submitting to it is nothing but not accepting haqq. Irtidad sometimes occurs due to a doubt. A sign that irtidad is due to a doubt is the request of time to rid the doubt. If the individual does not request time to remove his doubt the irtidad of this individual is nothing more than not accepting haqq." (Mabsut 10/99)

4- The Reality of Ignorance not being an excuse and the Refutation of some doubts regarding ta'weel in Asluddeen

Those who have illnesses in their hearts have claimed and presented evidence from the Qur'an under the title "ignorance and being mistaken in i'tiqaad" that an individual will not be kafir and is excused for his ignorance in having a kufr belief which he does not have the knowledge of the action being kufr even though the Qur'an and sunnah had reached him, and even though he had the strength to learn the hukm of the Qur'an. The evidence they present will be mentioned inshaAllah and will be shown how incredibly mistaken they are. This way the degree of error in the method of the taghout, its associates and all those who provide assistance to it will be clearly visible inshaAllah. **a- The wrongful conclusions extracted from the Qur'an are invalid**

1- The permit of error does not signify generality

First doubt: Embracing the belief error being a permit and in this sense claiming ignorance is a part of this

According to some the ummah is not responsible for the matters of tawhid, usul and furu; therefore is not responsible with ignorance. Those who claim this embrace the following ayah as evidence:

"Our Lord! Condemn us not if we forget or fall into error; our Lord!" (al-Baqarah 2/286)

"But there is no blame on you if ye make a mistake therein: (what counts is) the intention of your hearts." (al-Ahzab 33/5)

These individuals also embrace the following ahadith in their defence:

RasulAllah (saw) said: "When a judge gives a decision, having tried his best to decide correctly and is right, there are two rewards for him; and if he gave a judgment after having tried his best (to arrive at a

correct decision) but erred, there is one reward for him.”
(Bukhari; Muslim; Ibn Majah, Ahmad; Abu Dawud; Tirmidhi; Nasai)

RasulAllah (saw) said: "Anyone who exercises his personal reasoning and achieves the right, he will get two times the reward. However, if any mistake occurs in ijtihad, even then he will get one time the reward." (Tirmidhi)

One day RasulAllah (saw) asked one of his companions Amr ibn al-As (ra) to make a judgment about a dispute. He (ra) said, 'How can I exercise my ijtihad while you are present?' RasulAllah (saw) said, 'Yes (do it), if you achieve the right then will receive two times the reward. Even if you make a mistake in your ijtihad, you will still receive one time the reward'." (Ghazali, al-Mustasfa, 2/354)

Once RasulAllah (saw) asked Uqbah ibn Amir al-Juhani and Amr ibn al-As to make judgment between two opposing parties and said, "If you are right in your judgment, you will receive reward of ten good deeds and if you are mistaken, you will have reward of one good deed." (Ghazali, al-Mustasfa, 2/354) In a different version of the hadith it is narrated that Uqbah ibn Amir stated that one day two opposing parties came to RasulAllah (saw) for settlement of their dispute. "RasulAllah (saw) said to me: 'O Uqbah, get up and make judgment between them.' I said, 'May my father and mother be sacrificed for you O RasulAllah, you are more suitable for this.' He (saw) said, 'Anyway, you should make the judgment between them.' I said, 'On what basis?' He (saw) replied, 'Exercise your reasoning. If you achieve the right, you will have reward of ten good deeds. If you are mistaken in your judgment, you will have reward of one good deed'." (Ahmad)

"Allah has forgiven my ummah for mistakes, forgetfulness and what they are forced to do." (Ibn Majah; Tabarani, Mu'jamu's-Saghir; classed as hasan by Nawawi and sahih by Ibn Hibban and Hakim)

They claim this permit is general and that it also allots generality to the ayah of shirk. This claim of theirs is one of the worst claims against the deen and unfortunately it is a sign that the doer is imitating the Jews and following their footsteps. On the contrary the permit of error is not general within the understanding of the Qur'an, the Sunnah, and the ijma of the ummah, the sahabah and the imams after them. It is very clear that the doer of shirk is out of fold of deen and he is not addressed (as a mushrik) in the hadith nor the ayah at all. *i- Evidence from the Book regarding the permit of error not being general*

Evidence #1: "lest your deeds become vain and ye perceive not." (al-Hujrat 49/2)

It's indication to the matter is that his actions are gone to waste although the individual is in the state of not having perceived (realized).

In his tafsir section Bukhari interprets the ayah "ye perceive not" as 'you won't know' (without having knowledge of its information). (Bukhari)

This evidence shows that if the Muslim individual states or performs actions which make their deeds/actions go to waste they will not realize this and will continue (whatever they are doing).

Regarding this ayah in as Sarim, Ibn Taymiyyah points out the following: It (action/deed) going to waste in complete will only happen with kufr. Just like being forgiven in complete is done with tawbah. This is from among the principles of the ahl sunnah: This ayah shows that kufr is not included in the generality of the permit of error.

Evidence #2: "If thou dost question them, they declare (with emphasis): 'We were only talking idly and in play.' Say: 'Was it at Allah, and His Signs, and His Messenger that ye were mocking?'" (Tawbah 9/65)

These individuals had made this statement knowing it is haraam and with it had not intended kufr (to become kafir) Just as Ibn Taymiyyah had embraced. They have dispelled the kufr from its doer in idle play as in ikrah (coercion), they held the belief that kufr is valid only if the doer intends it and is serious. Regardless of this the sharee'ah accepted them as kafir and had not accepted their excuse. Although these individuals had been ignorant in regards to this mentioned kufr, they had not been excused due to the permit of being mistaken. This nass shows that kufr is considered an exception from generality of the permit of mistake.

Evidence #3: It is possible to come to the same conclusion (ihtijaj) from the generality of the nifaq ayah: "and realise (it) not!." (al-Baqarah 2/9) "Of a surety, they are the ones who make mischief, but they realise (it) not." (al-Baqarah 2/12) "but they do not know." (Bakara 2/13)

ii- The attribute of ahl qiblah being evanescent

When it comes to coming to a conclusion of the following two ayah;

"Our Lord! Condemn us not if we forget or fall into error; our Lord!" (al-Baqarah 2/286)

"It is no crime in you if ye seek of the bounty of your Lord" (al-Baqarah 2/198)

Surely the permit mentioned here is for the ahl qiblah. As known the attribute of ahl qiblah is only valid for the muwahhid and hanif, the one who denies all those which ibadaah is performed to, other than Allah, the one who has knowingly and intentionally abandoned shirk and also who has made tawhid of Allah the Wahid and Kahhar. Only an individual as such can benefit from the permits of ahl qiblah. When it comes to the mushrik and kafir they are not even accounted as ahl-i qiblah.

This issue had been addressed in great detail:

- [The 'Hanif' is the one to Abandons Shirk Knowingly and Intentionally](#)

In the sharh of Fiqhu'l-Akbar Aliyyul Kari stated: "Qadi Azuziddin in his book 'al-Mawafik' said: No one among the ahl-qiblah will be called kafir unless he denies Allah (awj), or associates partners to Allah (swt), or deny the prophethood or a hukm which comes to us with a necessary information or denies an issue which ittifak is made upon such as accepting halaal which is haraam in reality. And the one who makes takfir of an individual among ahl qiblah will be fasik and not kafir. The statement of scholars 'we do not see it permissible to call any among ahl qiblah, kafir' the intention of the statements is not only the inclination towards the qiblah. These statements are not sufficient. It is because the Ghulat sect of Rafidha claim that Jibril (as) made a mistake while delivering the revelation and in reality Allah (swt) had sent Jibril (as) to Ali (ra) however he delivered the revelation mistakenly to RasulAllah (saw). Whereas they are not among ahl-qiblah. Some among this sect of Ghulat went so extreme as much as claiming Ali (ra) was ilah. Even if they pray salah directing it towards the qiblah they are kafir. This is the meaning of the hadith of RasulAllah (saw): "...pray like our prayers, face our Qiblah and slaughter as we slaughter, then their blood and property will be sacred to us and we will not interfere with them except legally and their reckoning will be with Allah." (Bukhari)" (Sharh Fiqhu'l-Akbar 311-312)

Baghdadi allocates a chapter regarding those sects whom do not belong to Islam while attributing themselves Islam and he dealt with them in 47 pgs. He mainly classified them 20 sects (Sabaiyya, Bayaniyya, Mughiriyya, Harbiyya, Mansuriyya, Janahiyya, Hattabiyya, Ghurabiyya, Mufawwida, Ruzammiya, Shurayiyya-Namirriyya, Hululiyya, Ashabu'l-Ibaha, Ashabu't-Tanasuh, Habitiyya, Himariyya, Yazeediyya, Hallajiyya, Azafiriyya, Maymuniyya and Batiniyya) and their sub-groups and declare that they are not among ahl-qiblah. (al-Fark Bayn'al-Fark 142-189)

Baghdadi discussed the term ahl-qiblah and what it includes and said: "Previously we had explained that some people claimed that all those who accepted and confirmed the nubuwwa of Muhammad (saw) and all that he brought –regardless of their other views- will be given the name "from deenul Islam". This is al Ka'bi's choice in his 'Makalat'. Karramiyya had claimed that all those who stated "La-ilaha illallah Muhammadun RasulAllah" without looking whether they are with ikhlas or believe in the opposite they will be given the name (attribute) "from millah of Islam". It would be necessary that both these groups include the al-Isawiyya and al-Mushikaniyya from the Jews in to the Islamic ummah because they utter "La-ilaha illallah Muhammadun RasulAllah"; they claimed Muhammad had been sent to the Arabs and believed that what he had brought was haqq. Some fuqaha among ahl-hadith stated the name "ummah of Islam" is given to all those who believe the necessity of performing salah turned to the qiblah 5 times a day. This is not correct because in the era of the sahabah many of those who left the fold of Islam by rejecting the payment of zakah believed in the necessity of performing salah turned

to the Qaba. They had exited deen only because they had denied the necessity of zakah. These are the murtad from Banu Kinda and Tamim. When it comes to the murtad from Banu Hanifa and Banu Asad they had become kafir for two reasons. One is that they denied the necessity of zakah and the second is their claim of Musaylima and Tulayha to be prophets. Also the Banu Hanifa had denied the ayah of the fajr salah and maghrib salah with this they had added kufr upon kufr. According to us the correct thing is that the name "ummah of Islam" is given to all those who accept the creator of the alam (Hudus), the Kidam and Oneness in its Creator (Sani'), by denying the tashbih and ta'til on the attributes, uttering He is Adil and Hakim and besides these, the prophethood of the prophets, the truth in the fact that Muhammad (saw) was sent as a Nabi to all mankind, sharee'ah being eternal, the truth it has brought, Qur'an is the source of its sharee'ah, the necessity of praying 5 daily salat while directing it to Qaba, the one who confirms fasting of Ramadhan and those who accept the necessity of making pilgrimage to Baytullah. All those who accept these will be accepted as the members of the Islamic ummah. After this his situation will be looked at: If he had not mixed anything in his iman which will take him to kufr he is an ahl-tawhid sunni. However if he adds ugly bid'ah to these, his situation will be looked at: If he adheres to Batiniyya or Bayaniyya or Mughiriyya or Mansuriyya or Janahiyya or Sabaiyya or Hattabiyya of Rafidha or (if he) believes Hululiyya or Tanasuh or Maymuhiyya of Khawaarij or in the way of Yazidiyya or Habitiyya or the Khimariyya of Qadariyyah; if he is among those who make haraam to himself what the Qur'an makes halaal or among those who make halaal to himself what the Qur'an makes haraam (then) he is not among from the ummah of Islam. However if his bid'ah is the type of Zaydiyya or Imamiyya of Rafidha or the type of the bid'ah of the majority of Khawaarij or the type of the bid'ah of Mutazila or Najjariyya or Jahmiyya or Dirariyya or Mujassima which is accounted among the ummah of Islam then he will be accounted among the ummah of Islam regarding some of the rulings. Meaning they will be buried in the graveyards of the Muslim, if he goes to ghaza (war) with the Muslims then he will be given a portion from the ganimah (booty); he will not be restricted to entering the mosques of Muslims and pray in there. But he will be accounted to be not from among the ummah of Islam regarding the some of the rulings. Meaning it is not permissible to pray for him after his death or to pray behind him. His slaughter will not be permissible to eat. Their woman will not be permissible to a sunni man. And a man who is one of them will not be permissible to marry with a sunni woman. (al-Fark Bayna'l-Firak, 142-143)

"if we forget or fall into error..." (al-Baqarah 286) The term nisyan which is mentioned in the ayah is the absentmindedness/distractedness of the heart from what it is commanded to act upon thus he leaves it forgetfully. The term hata which is mentioned in the ayah is to intend to do something which is permissible but then he falls into something which is not permissible to do. Allah (awj) pardoned these two things on this ummah whenever they occur as a mercy and benefice to them. The proof for this is, as seen in the ayah; the permit of being mistaken comes only after iman has been established and it has been indicated: "The Messenger believeth in what hath been revealed to him from his Lord, as do the men of faith... Our Lord! Condemn us not if

we forget or fall into error.." (al-Baqarah 2/285-286)

Now after all this it must be understood that surely the permit of being mistaken is given only after tawhid which is asluddeen and its amount of iman is established. This is like the following hadith mentioned in Bukhari: "...While we were in the company of RasulAllah (saw) he said: Swear allegiance to me that you will not associate anything with Allah, that you will not commit adultery, that you will not steal, that you will not take any life which it is forbidden by Allah to take but with (legal) justification; and whoever among you fulfils it, his reward is with Allah and he who commits any such thing and is punished for it, that will be all atonement for it And if anyone commits anything and Allah conceals (his faults), his matter rests with Allah. He may forgive if He likes, and He may punish him if He likes." In another version of the hadith it is recorded as: "...RasulAllah (saw) took (a pledge) from us as he took from the women that we will not associate anything with Allah and we will not steal, and we will not commit adultery, and we will not kill our children, and we will not bring calumny upon one another. And he who amongst you fulfils (this pledge), his reward rests with Allah, and he upon whom amongst you is imposed the prescribed punishment and that is carried out, that is his expiation (for that sin), and he whose (sins) were covered by Allah, his matter rests with Allah. He may punish him if He likes or may forgive him if He so likes." (Bukhari; Muslim; Darimi; Nasai)

Hafidh had narrated the following by Nawawi: The generality of this hadith had been allotted with this ayah (Muslim): "Allah forgiveth not that partners should be set up with Him; but He forgiveth anything else, to whom He pleaseth." (Nisa 4/48) In this situation when the murtad is killed for his irtidad this murder will not be considered kafarah for him. (Fath'ul-Bari, 1/81-83) Hafidh later begins to narrate the ta'weel of the ulamaa regarding the matter. After this he informs he adopts the view of Nawawi.

This is as such because the generality of shirk being haraam and its being non forgivable in certainty, is certain generality and is allotted all permits given to the ahl qiblah. The reason is they already had deserved this attribute by establishing tawhid, making ibadaah sole to Him, and have isolated themselves from everything that ibadaah is performed to other than Allah.

Tabari regarding the following ayah stated: "Our Lord! Condemn us not if we forget or fall into error." (al-Baqarah 2/286) This is Allah (awj) teaching His mu'min slaves the way of dua. How they will call upon Him and what they will say to Him while making dua. The meaning of this is: Say our Rabb, don't hold us responsible for those which is made fard upon us but we have forgotten to perform and also if we had made error in an act which you had restricted from performing not because we wanted to rebel against you but because of our ignorance and our mistake. (Tafsir) Regarding the ayah "Our Lord! Condemn us not if we forget or fall into error." (al-Baqarah 2/286) he narrated from Ibn Zayd with his own sanad: If we forget one of which you had made fard upon us or if we make a mistake in that which you had made haraam (for us).

Now from the slave those which occur due to neglect, is abandoning that which is commanded to him. Upon this his request from Allah not be held responsible is forgetfulness. Adam had been punished and thrown from jannah for this reason. Regarding this it is stated in the ayah: "We had already, beforehand, taken the covenant of Adam, but he forgot: and We found on his part no firm resolve." (Ta-ha 20/115) This is that mistake which Allah (awj) commands "That day shall We forget them as they forgot the meeting of this day of theirs, and as they were wont to reject Our signs." (al-Araf 7/51) **iii- The Permit of mistake regarding those other than kufr**

Fundamentally with the slave saying "Our Lord! Condemn us not if we forget or fall into error" (al-Baqarah 2/286) his request from Allah (awj) is due to his forgetfulness in matters which are commanded he perform. Ofcourse the mentioned act of abandonment which is not caused by himself, due to negligence and deficiency must not be kufr. Surely when this is kufr it is not permissible for the slave in this situation to request from Allah that he not be held responsible for his actions. The reason is because Allah (swt) had informed His slaves that He (awj) will not forgive the act of shirk against Him. Let alone the act of which the individual requests to be forgiven is an act Allah had informed of being an act which can not be performed by mistake. According to this surely the request of forgiveness can only be regarding the following matters:

Forgetting after having memorised the recitation of the Qur'an or forgetting a single prayer or forgetting to fast etc due to busyness.

"Thus being mistaken is of two types: 1- When the slave purposely and knowingly performs the acts which he has been warned against. This is the mistake the slave will be responsible for... The slaves' request that his Rabb to be forgiven is a type of sin which he had performed but also that which is not kufr." (Tabari, Tafsir)

The ta'weel of the Imam of the mufassir regarding the mentioned ayah is as such. Regarding the author of the tafsir Ibn Taymiyyah said: "When it comes to the tafsir, people have, the most correct one is the tafsir of Muhammad Jarir at-Tabari. He narrates the words of the salaf with stable sanad. As there is no bid'ah in it narrations from individuals who have been condemned (with bid'ah) can't be found either. The tafsir of Ibn Jarir is the most correct tafsir among Baghawi, Qurtubi, Ibn Atiyya, Zamahshari etc." (Fatawa, 13/385-388)

Surely Imam'ul Mufassir (Tabari) had mentioned that the permit for being mistaken and forgetting are in those other than kufr. This following ayah clarifies this "Allah forgiveth not that partners should be set up with Him; but He forgiveth anything else, to whom He pleaseth." (Nisa 4/48) This is like this because as mentioned previously surely the ahl qiblah are those who make tawbah from shirk and embrace all the distinguished characteristics of Islam as mentioned in the ayah: "But (even so), if they repent, establish regular prayers, and practise regular charity,- they are your brethren in Faith: (thus) do We explain the Signs in detail, for those who understand. " (at-Tawba 9/11) Ibn Abbas (ra) had stated that

‘with this ayah the blood of the ahl qiblah had been made haraam.’ (Qurtubi)

According to this the attribute of the ahl qiblah is as follows: To have stripped from shirk and embraced the distinguished characteristics of the sharee'ah. The individual with such characteristics can only benefit from the permits of the ahl qiblah. When it comes to the one who is mushrik; he is the one who has lost his attribute of ahl qiblah. Therefore he can not benefit from its permits.

Ibn Taymiyyah stated regarding the hadith "Allah has forgiven my ummah for whatever crosses their mind so long as they do not speak of it or act upon it." (Bukhari; Muslim) To forgive what goes on with the nafs is valid for the ummah of Muhammad (saw) who believes in Allah, His angels, His books, His envoys and the day of judgement. Surely it is known that this forgiving will be in situations which do not harm the iman. When it comes to the situations which harm the iman the hadith does not comprise things as such. It is because when these nullify the iman the doer is no longer a part from the ummah of Muhammad (saw). He takes the degree of the munafiq. Therefore it is not necessary he be forgiven for the words that cross his mind and his actions. That which this hadith points to is an open difference. Likewise the evidences of the sharee'ah all come together in this sense. This is just like Allah forgiving the mistake and forgetting from this ummah of those which the book and sunnah point out. According to this whomsoever has the right iman his mistake and forgetfulness and those that cross his mind are forgiven. Just like they will be taken out of jahannam. This is contrary to the one who does not have an iman. Surely the nass does not show that an individual as such is not held responsible for those that cross his mind, his mistake and his sin." (Fatawa 10/760)

This explanation of Ibn Taymiyyah clearly shows that the individual who will benefit from the permits of the ahl qiblah must have a sahih iman and that forgiveness is actualised only in situations which do not nullify the iman. When it comes to the kafir mushrik and the individual who is from the ahl qiblah but has wrecked his iman this means that the hadith does not comprise them. Likewise the evidences from sharee'ah support this.

iv- Evidence from the sunnah concerning the issue of the permit of being mistaken not being general

The first hadith: This hadith is the hadith regarding the Khawaarij.

They had invented an i'tiqaad and thought that they were the select slaves of Allah that they differed from others, and only they were the accepted slaves in the sight of Allah. Dependent to this they made takfir of everyone who opposed their i'tiqaad. Along with this they were living a life in great ibadaah. Regardless of this the ummah had mad ittifaq that the Khawaarij were condemned and deviated. Moreover there was ikhtilaf even regarding their kufr. Besides this regarding them RasulAllah said: "They would recite the Qur'an thinking that it supports them, whereas it is evidence against them." (Muslim)

Nevertheless regardless of their ta'weel and ignorance as the ummah had been muttafiqa regarding them being sinners, they had not excused them with the permit of being mistaken.

Regarding the Khawaarij imam Tabari stated: It is known that they had committed the offence of seeing the blood and property of the Muslim halaal merely because they (the Khawaarij) had made mistaken ta'weel regarding the ayah of Qur'an and gave them a meaning which had not been meant. (Fath-ul Bari)

This hadith establishes that the permit of being mistaken is not general. Therefore it's certain it had been allocated. This can either be in the details (furu) of deen or in usulu i'tiqaad or in usuluddeen which means tawhid and the abandonment of shirk. Now if the allocation is valid in furu in this case it will also be valid for usuli i'tiqaad and most certainly for usuluddeen.

Likewise if it is valid in usul-u i'tiqaad it must certainly be valid in priority within usuluddeen. If it is for asluddeen meaning if it is established that the allocation is for asluddeen as there will be no need left for it to be for usulu i'tiqaad neither for the furu of sharee'ah. Now with all these possibilities it is established that in the sense of tawhid and the abandonment of shirk; which are asluddeen allocation regarding the permit being general is established.

The second hadith: This hadith is mentioned in the Sahih of Bukhari "... 'I do not know! I used to say what I heard the people saying!..." (Bukhari)

Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani said: "And in it is the blameworthiness of believing in something in order to follow others, due to the punishment that will be meted out to the one who said: 'I used to hear the people saying something, so, I said it.'" (Fathal-Bari, 3/284)

As known the imitator is an ignorant and mistaken individual. Yet he is not excused of ignorance in his bateel imitation and he is not considered excusable for his mistake either.

The third hadith: This is the hadith Bukhari recorded in his Sahih: "A slave of Allah may utter a word without thinking whether it is right or wrong. He may slip down in the fire as far away a distance equal to that between the east and west." In a riwaya mentioned in Sahihayn it is stated: "It will not be known what it meant" (Bukhari, Muslim)

Hafidh regarding the word 'yahwi' (to be dropped/ slipped) said: Tirmidhi recorded this hadith with the chain of Muhammad b Ishaq: "He does not see any harm in it but he will be thrown to a distance of 70 years in the jahannam for it." (Fathu'l-Bari, Kitabu'r-Rikak, 11/314-318)

This hadith is regarding the individual who speaks a word which draws the anger of Allah. Although when he speaks the masiyah (evil) and transgression is not so clear; with it he is thrown into 70 layers of jahannam. In this sense he is not seen excused due to ignorance and being mistaken.

Shayh Izzaddeen b. Abdussalam states: 'This is something the one who makes the statement can not differentiate the good or evil of it. For this reason it is haraam for a human to speak of that which he can not distinguish the beautiful from the ugly.' Nawawi states 'In this hadith there is encouragement to protect the tongue. According to this the one who wishes to speak must think of what he is going to say before speaking. If he sees benefit in himself he will speak or else he'll keep quite.' It is understood in these statements that before making a statement the individual must examine the meaning and concept as he must stay away from that which he cannot

distinguish beautiful from ugly. And this is a must.” (As Sarim’ul Maslul, 154)

“Hafidh states: ‘An individual who hears something which can not be understood, in other words, the meaning for him is not cared for, and is not requested. The meaning is not set in his mind or is not even thought to be set, however it will be used when he sees the need to.’ (Fath’ul-Bari, 11/314-318)

Without specialising this hadith the best explanation to exemplify this hadith is the situation of the Khawaarij who objected to the shareout of RasulAllah (saw). He has said: Surely with this shareout the sake of Allah had not been intended. Essentially this presumptuous person had wanted to correct an act he believed was munkar. However he had said something he expected ajr for. Yet with it he became a murtad kafir. Whereas he had not calculated that this would necessitate the anger of Allah. Fundamentally because the irtidat here is not dhahir he had not seen it to be problematic. Regardless of these this individual had not been excused for being mistaken and ignorant. In this sense it is understood that in regards to kufr the permit of being mistaken is not valid and that it is allocated. Let alone there are many other ahadith regarding this issue.

v- Evidences from ijma regarding the permit of being mistaken not being general

Qadi Iyad said: “Ubaydullah ibn Hasan al-Anbari, had informed us the views of the mujtahid was correct regarding the following issue: In a matter dependent on ta’weel regarding usuluddeen the truth is in one point. One becomes a sinner, rebel and a fasiq when he is mistaken in the mentioned matter and when other comments aren’t made yet when ijma is made on a given comment this ijma of the ummah is the last decision which marks the final point. Fundamentally the only ikhtilaf regarding this matter is whether such individual becomes kafir or not.” (Ash-Shifa bi Sharh-i Nuraddin al-Kari, 5/393-394)

The ijma regarding the one who is mistaken in usuluddeen being a sinner, a rebel and a fasiq and the ikhtilaf in making takfir of such individual. This means that the ummah had made ijma with ittifaq that the permit of being mistaken is in matters other than Usuluddeen. What is meant by Usuluddeen are the base principles of the ahli sunnah i’tiqaad. Matters such as; iman is statement and action, Allah being in heaven, that Allah will be seen in the akhirah and that the Qur’an is the qalam of Allah and not mahluq. Those who oppose in matters as such are mistaken sinners and making takfir of them has become a matter of ikhtilaf. In this sense he becomes a bid’ah doer for opposing the base principles of that which the ahli sunnah made ijma. When it is said that there is ikhtilaf regarding the takfir of such individual this ikhtilaf is certainly not regarding matters of embracing tawhid and abandoning shirk. For this reason Qadi Iyad had recorded it as ‘contrary to tawhid matters which are suitable for ta’weel’. The reason is because tawhid is the basis of the principles and is asluddeen.

The author of Awn’ul Ma’bud quoted from Adburrahman that he states: “I asked my father and Abu Zur’a the views of the ahl-i sunnah in usuluddeen and upon what we understand the selef to be upon and what they believed in. He answered in the following manner: The views of the ulamaa which we have reached in all cities such as Hijaz, Iraq, Egypt, Sham and Yaman was like this: Surely iman is statement and action. It will increase and decrease. The Qur’an is the word of Allah and not a mahluq in any way. Qadar with khair (goodness) and shar (badness) are all from

Allah. Surely Allah (awj) is above the arsh and is different from His creations. He is like He has described in His book and by the tongue of His Rasul (saw). He has surrounded everything with His ilm without howness (bila kayf). 'There is nothing whatever like unto Him, and He is the One that hears and sees (all things).' (ash-Shura 42/11)" (Awn'ul-Ma'bud Sharh'u sunnan-i Abu Dawud, 13/48)

This is the base principles of i'tiqaad and deen. The salaf had made ikhtilaf regarding the takfir of the bid'ah doers who opposes in these matters. Some have chosen to make takfir, the majority have adopted not to make takfir of them with the condition that they are muwahhid and have embraced the distinguishing characteristics of Islam.

In his comment he made the following explanation regarding the following hadith "I have been commanded to fight against people until they testify that there is no god but Allah" Hafidh stated: "From this, it could be (one could) come to the conclusion of abandoning the takfir of the bid'ah doers who state tawhid and embrace its distinguished characteristics." (Fathu'l Bari 1/97)

What the salaf of the ummah had made ittifaq of is surely the ikhtilaf of takfir being only regarding the bid'ah doers of this ummah who are the muwahhid and have embraced the distinguished characteristics of Islam.

vi- The conditions of Ijtihad

The following hadith "When a judge makes ijtihaad..." (Bukhari; Muslim)

Ijtihaad (legal reasoning) means to exert maximum effort to carry a heavy object. This meaning is heavily represented in its technical definition to exert maximum effort to arrive to a conclusion in a matter related to the shari'ah. Prior to discussion regarding anything it is important to emphasize that ijtihaad can only be regarding matters of furu/ detail and and let alone usuluddeen ijtihaad can not be made even regarding matters of i'tiqaad. Besides even in matters which there are certain evidences from the sharee'ah regarding the furu ijtihaad can not be made. For instance the number of rakah in salah and it being fard, hajj and sawm being wajib also that which there are certain restrictions within the sharee'ah like fornication being haraam etc ijtihaad can not be made. Ijtihaad is only in the absence of no clear conclusion, either due to the lack of very clear textual evidence or no definite interpretation of a text. One of the main rules in the fundamentals of fiqh is 'ijtihaad is not valid in the presence of nass (clear textual evidence)'. According to this it is only possible within the frame of the shairah; which is amal-i detail that no measure of sharee'ah (nass) is available (present). In this sense the mujtahid must possess the mediums of ijtihaad. If he does not possess the attributes he is a sinner which RasulAllah (saw) had described in his hadith regarding the 3 qadi:

"There are three types of judges, one will be in jannah and two in jahannam. That judge who recognizes the truth and rules in favor of it, will be in jannah. That judge who recognizes the truth and rules in contrary to it will be in jahannam. That judge who rules in ignorance (without making attempt to verify the truth) will be (also) in jahannam." (Nawawi, 2/76)

As seen here for the mujtahid to attain ajr there are two conditions:

1- Being an alim who carried the conditions of ijtiḥad upon him. The sharee'ah most certainly does not permit an ignorant to make ijtiḥad.

2- Making ijtiḥad regarding a matter which there is no evidence within the sharee'ah regarding amal-i or dhann-i furu/detail. Surely the sharee'ah had made tawḥid muḥkam because this is asluddeen. Most of the usul of i'tiqaad and also the amal-i furuad are like this. For example the fard and fornication being haraam etc. Ijtiḥad can not be made regarding them. In matters as such as it is not permissible for the mujtahid who possesses the conditions of making ijtiḥad to make ijtiḥad it will not be permitted for the ignorant to make ijtiḥad either.

According to this whoever makes ijtiḥad regarding these will without doubt become a sinner. Just like the one who does not carry the conditions of making ijtiḥad, makes an ijtiḥad regarding matters which the sharee'ah permits. Such individual surely without debate is a sinner. The salaf and imams of the ummah had made ittifaq regarding the matter explained up until now. Likewise Qadi Iyad had narrated that there is ijma regarding this.

In his comment to the ḥadith "When a judge makes ijtiḥad... Imam Nawawi stated: "According to the pronouncement of the ulamaa the Muslim had made ijma that this ḥadith was regarding an alim judge who is ahl-hukm (capable to make ijtiḥad). If he recognizes (truth) there is 2 ajr for him. One ajr is for his ijtiḥad and the other is in counterpart for his (correct) recognizing. If he is mistaken this time there is only one ajr for his ijtiḥad. In the ḥadith there is mahzuf/ a shortening. The takdir of it is like this: It means when the judge makes ijtiḥad with willpower. When it comes to the individual who is not perfect to make hukm it is not halaal for him to make hukm. If he is to make hukm as he will not be able to get ajr he will be a sinner and whether it fits haqq or not, his hukm will not be implemented. The reason is because his hukm which recognizing the truth is only a coincidence and it was not established from bases from the sharee'ah. Whether this individual is correct or not he is a rebel in all his hukm. Therefore all his hukm are mardut (rejected). In this sense he will not be excused in any of the hukm he had made. In the ḥadith mentioned in the sunnan it is stated as follows: "There are three types of judges, one will be in jannah and two in jahannam. That judge who recognizes the truth and rules in favor of it, will be in jannah. That judge who recognizes the truth and rules in contrary to it will be in jahannam. That judge who rules in ignorance (without making attempt to verify the truth) will be (also) in jahannam." Later he continues to explain whether each mujtahid recognizes the truth or if only one is correct and he continues with the following: "Surely this ikhtilaf is only regarding the ijtiḥad made in furuad. Or else the agreement (ijma) of the individuals whose words are trusted, in the basis of Tawḥid is only one individual who recognizes the truth." (Sharḥ Saḥih Muslim, 12/13)

The author of the work Awn'ul Mabud in the comment on this ḥadith narrated from Hattabi the following: "Surely the one who is mistaken in ijtiḥad will gain ajr for requesting haqq. The reason is because his ijtiḥad is ibadaah. Therefore he does not gain ajr for being mistaken on the contrary only the sin sourced from this mistake is lifted. This is valid for the individual who possesses the conditions of

ijtihad who knows the usul and who is aware of the types of qiyaas. However the individual who is not ahl (cognoscenti) for ijtihad because he will have forced himself he will not be excused with his mistake. On the contrary it be feared he is a sinner. This hadith denotes this: "there are three types of judges, one who will be in Jannat and two in Jahannam..." Surely this situation is regarding those which are left outside of usul and is regarding furu which includes various ways. It is because usul means the propriety of shairah and the base hukm which is not open to various possibilities that has no path to ta'weel. Surely those who are mistaken in these are not excused for their mistake. For this reason his hukm regarding this matter is rejected. (Awn'ul-Mabud Sharh'u sunnan-i Abu Dawud, 9/488-489)

For more detail regarding this matter refer back to Fathu'l Bari and other sharh of hadith books.

vii- Ijtihad can not be made in Muhkam matters

Ijtihad is not valid in the presence of nass (clear textual evidence). This applies to only matters outside the field of belief and worship, such as business, family and social affairs.

Ibn Taymiyyah said: "issues of ijtihad are those for which there is no evidence that must clearly be followed, such as a sahih hadith which is not contradicted by a hadith of similar strength. In the absence of such evidence, ijtihad is valid because there is contradictory evidence or the evidence is not clear at all." (Bayaan al-Daleel 'ala Batlaan al-Tahleel, 210-211) Ibn Qayyim said: "if there is no Sunnah or consensus regarding an issue, then ijtihad is permissible and the one who acts on the basis of ijtihad, whether he is a mujtahid or is following a mujtahid, is not to be denounced." (I'laam al-Muwaqqi'een, 3/300-301)

In an excerpt taken from Ghazzali regarding the description of ijtihad Imam Shawkani states: It is expending all effort and endeavor directed toward research in a matter which condemning will not be suitable to itself. Fundamentally this is the path of matters of furu. For this reason the mentioned matters are called matters of ijtihad and the one who does research mujtahid. However fundamental matters are not like this. Some among them had said this: Ijtihad is the faqihs' expending all effort to establish zann/ opinion regarding sharr-i hukm. Here the condition of zann has been added because in matters of certainty there is no ijtihad.

If this statement of Imam Shawkani is understood according to his description mujtahid means the faqih who expends all effort to establish dhann regarding a sharr-i hukm. If the description of ijtihad and mujtahid is understood it must also be known that the matters of ijtihad are sharr-i hukm of amal.

In Mahsul it is stated: "The matter ijtihad is made of are all sharr-i hukm which there is no absolute evidence. By saying sharr-i here we wanted to exclude the matters which are not (matters) of aql and (matters) of qalam. Likewise we used the statement 'which there is not absolute evidence' with the aim to distinguish 5 given times of salah, zakah and the waajib characteristics of Islam which the ummah made ijma of. The seventh matter: There has been ikhtilaf regarding 'the mujtahid having recognised the truth' and 'haqq is with only one mujtahid'. The views regarding these matters can be described under

two headings:

a) Evidences of 'aql: These are divided into a few types.

1- The type of mistake which does not prevent any information regarding Allah and His Rasul. For example matters such as; the 'ilm of the Creator and Tawhid also proving justice. The right in these matters is only one, it is said whoever has recognised the truth will have recognised haqq and whoever is mistaken is a kafir.

2- The truth to the matters of seeing Allah (ruyat), the creation of the Qur'an, the muwahhid exiting jahannam is one (there is only one hukm). It is said whoever has recognised the truth in these is upon the right path; whoever is mistaken will be made takfir of. One of those who claim this is Shafi. Also some of his friends have commented on his view according to the dhahir some had attributed this statement as kufr al-nimah (Kufr al-Asghar i.e the minor disbelief which does not exclude one from the fold of Islam)." (Irshad'ul Fuhul Bab'ul Ijtihad 250-259)

In reality these issues are taken in hand in works of the sharh of Sunnah and usulu fiqh in detail. Surely the mujtahid must carry the conditions of ijtihaad. The issues ijtihaad is made of are amal-i detail which no stable evidence is available. Now how could the view of the individual who defends the mushrik mujtahid (the individual who has fallen in shirk with his ijtihaad) to be excused with the hadith of 'when the judge makes ijtihaad...' and the ayah "Our Lord! Condemn us not if we forget or fall into error." (al-Baqarah 2/286)?

This can not be possible for a few reasons:

1- The mushrik are not among the ahl qiblah.

2- He does not carry the conditions of ijtihaad

3- He has made an ijtihaad regarding a matter although he had not been permitted to do so.

What will be the condition of the one who performs no effort, maybe even by imitating he mixed up in shirk and with it lives unwary, moreover he is careless of his situation and although has ability and sources to escape from it (mistake and shirk)?

The following are about the Sahabah and the imams after them regarding this matter:

a- The attitude of the sahabah towards those who did not pay zakah is much known. Those people being mistaken regarding this following ayah "Of their goods, take alms, that so thou mightest purify and sanctify them; and pray on their behalf. Verily thy prayers are a source of security for them: And Allah is One Who heareth and knoweth." (at-Tawbah 9/103) were not excused for their ta'weel and being mistaken. On the contrary they were considered murtad and were fought against.

b- The attitude of Abdullah ibn Umar (ra) towards the Qadariyyah is also much known. He did not accredit them for the mixup they had fallen into and their will of freeing Allah from dhulm. Without realising they had fallen into a situation of making Allah deficient. Likewise he had made baraa from them finding sufficeint of what he merely heard about them.

c- The attitude of the imams towards the extreme bid'ah doers is also known. These imams had not excused any of them for their ta'weel, ignorance or mistake. The Jahmiyyah is an example for this.

Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "When it comes to the matters of appointment and designation of the sects which are perished first of all I'll mention the explanations of persons such as Yusuf ibn Asbay and Abdullah ibn al-Mubarak has reached us to account these sects in dalalah. These two mighty Imams of the Muslimeen state:

The pioneers of bid'ah are four:

- 1- The Rafidha
- 2- The Khawaarij
- 3- The Qadariyyah
- 4- The Murjiyyah

Upon this Ibn Mubarak was asked: What do you say about the Jahmiyyah? As an answer he expressed they are not from the ummah of Muhammad. Abdullah ibn al Mubarak would say: We will narrate the words of the Jews and the Christian but we will not narrate the words of the Jahmiyya. (Fatawa, 3/350)

Narrating from Bukhari Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "I say there is Qur'an in the book. There is also Qur'an in the hearts of people. Whoever claims the opposite will be called to make tawbah. If he makes tawbah it is good or else his path is the path of kufr." (Fatawa, 4/182)

According to the narration of the author of Awn'ul Mabud: "In the narration of Fadl ibn Ziyad when it reached imam Ahmad that someone had said Allah will not be seen in the akhirah upon this he became very angry and said the following: Whoever states Allah will not be seen in the akhirah surely will become a kafir. The curse of Allah is upon him. Also the anger of those among people who have anger will be on him also. Does not Allah (awj) command: "Some faces, that Day, will beam (in brightness and beauty);- Looking towards their Lord" (al-Qiyama 75/22-23) "Verily, from (the Light of) their Lord, that Day, will they be veiled." (al-Mutaffifin 83/15) This shows the mu'min will see Allah. Abu Dawud has stated "I heard him say whoever states Allah can not be seen is surely a kafir" when ruyah had been mentioned beside Ahmad ibn Hanbal. (Awn'ul-Mabud Sharh'u sunnan-i Abu Dawud, 13/54-55)

With the will of Allah we find these sufficient to have explained the above that the permit of being mistaken is only regarding matters outside of tawhid and the rejection/abandoning of shirk. Fundamentally this is stable with the book, Sunnah and ijma. Likewise the salaf and imams of the ummah carry the same view. I extended my explanation to clarify the issue for the reason that the permit of being mistaken has been used very often without validity. One of my aims was to destroy the illegal use of the permit of being mistaken. After all these explanations only the one who has nifaq in his

heart and heresy in their minds or those who are ignorant of the issue may continue to bring the permit of being mistaken as evidence to defend their false claims.

Tawfiq is from Allah.

2- Doubts regarding the request of Ibrahim (as) to see how the dead have been given life

“My Lord! Show me how You give life to the dead. He (Allah) said: "Do you not believe" He said: "Yes (I believe), but to put my heart at ease." (al-Baqarah 2/260)

The request of Ibrahim (as) was, the rest and inner peace that one attains as a result of direct personal observation. People have subjected this incident to very strange interpretations. If one bears in mind, however, Allah's dealings with the Prophets, one will not feel any need to strain one's energies in hammering out such artificially-contrived interpretations. The truth of the matter is that the type of function that ordinary believers are required to perform requires of them no more than believing in certain truths without perceiving them through their senses. The function entrusted by Allah to the Prophets is such that they ought to have direct knowledge of the truths, the acceptance of which they are required to invite others to. Thanks to the nature of their mission, the Prophets had to tell the world that while others resorted to conjecture and fancy, they spoke from personal direct observation and experience; that while others could claim to possess only imagination, they possessed reliable knowledge; that while others were blind, they alone had the Allah-given capacity to perceive the Truth. It is for this reason that the angels come to the Prophets and they see them with their own eyes. It is for the same reason that the Prophets were allowed a glimpse of the system of governance of the heavens and the earth. It is for the same reason, again, that they were enabled to observe Heaven and Hell and witness scenes of resurrection. The Prophets are in possession of faith in the Unseen at the time they are invested with prophet-hood. After being designated to prophet-hood, they are further honored by special favors and privileges, and initiated into what may be termed as 'faith in the seen' (for the 'Unseen' is changed for them to the 'seen'). This favor is a special prerogative of the Prophets.

Possible reasons behind the request of Ibrahim (as) recorded by scholars

1- Hasan al-Basri, Qatada, Dahhak, Ata, Ibn Jurayj and Ibn Zayd said that: The reason of his request is based upon his seeing a dead animal which was eaten and broken into pieces by some other animals; therefore he requested that the dead animal to be resurrected to raise the degree of his certainty by seeing which he already had certainty by ilm. Ibrahim (as) said: ‘My Lord! Show me how You give life to the dead’. Allah (swt) asked: ‘Do you not believe (this)?’ Ibrahim (as) said: ‘Yes I believe but learning from the news is not as the same as learning from seeing.’ (Tabari, Razi)

2- According to some other mufasssir the reason of the request of Ibrahim (as) was his debate with Nimrod. Muhammad b Ishaq and Qadi said: Ibrahim (as) and Nimrod debated as mentioned in the surat al-Anbiya. After Ibrahim (as) came over Nimrod in the debate he said: “My Lord! Show me how You give life to the dead. He (Allah) said: ‘Do you not believe’ He said: ‘Yes (I believe), but to put my heart at ease.’ Ibrahim (as) requested this to make his certainty stronger by seeing and not because he doubts regarding the power of Allah. Therefore this refers ‘to be

saved from the threat of Nimrod' or 'my proofs will be stronger'. (Tabari; Razi) "For instance, when Ibrahim said to Nimrod, 'My Lord (Allah) is He Who gives life and causes death' he wanted to solidify his knowledge about resurrection by actually witnessing it with his eyes. Prophet Ibrahim said, 'My Lord! Show me how You give life to the dead.' He (Allah) said: 'Do you not believe' He (Ibrahim) said: 'Yes (I believe), but to be stronger in faith.' Bukhari recorded that Abu Hurayrah said that RasulAllah said, 'We are more liable to be in doubt than Ibrahim when he said, My Lord! Show me how You give life to the dead'. Allah said, 'Don't you believe' Ibrahim said, 'Yes (I believe), but (I ask) in order to be stronger in faith.' The Prophet's statement in the Hadith means, 'We are more liable to seek certainty.'" (Ibn Kathir) Tabari comments: "Both these two views are close to each other. It is because in both narrations, Ibrahim (as) requested to see with his eyes something he already knew with ilm." (Tabari)

3- According to some other mufasssir the reason was Ibrahim (as) seeking whether or not he is khalil of Allah. Suddi narrates a conversation between Ibrahim (as) and the angel of death where the angel of death announced to Ibrahim (as) that he had been declared as khalil of Allah. After the angel of death left, Ibrahim (as) asked Allah 'My Lord! Show me how You give life to the dead' so that he knows he is khalil of Allah. Allah said: 'Do you not believe?' He said: 'Yes I believe', but to put my heart at ease that I am your khalil. (Tabari) Ibn Abbas, Saed b Jubary and Suddi said: 'When Allah (swt) had revealed to Ibrahim (as) that He is going to declare someone as His khalil, Ibrahim (as) asked regarding its signs. Allah (swt) said that the sign of that person is resurrecting the dead with his prayer. When his degree was raised, Ibrahim (as) remembered this and requested it from Allah (swt) so he understands whether or not he is the one who is declared as Khalil by Allah (jj). Allah (swt) asked: 'Do you not believe?' He said: 'Yes I believe', but to put my heart at ease that I am your khalil." (Razi)

4- According to the some of the mufasssir, the reason was the doubt which was put into the heart of Ibrahim (as) by shaitan. Shaitan put a doubt regarding Allah's power of resurrection of the dead. Ata b Rabaah said: 'Some of things (doubts) came into the heart of Ibrahim (as) which comes to the minds of some people therefore he requested from Allah (awj): 'My Lord! Show me how You give life to the dead.' Allah (swt) said: 'Do you not believe?' and He said: 'Yes (I believe), but to put my heart at ease.' At the same topic Abu Hurayrah narrated that RasulAllah said. 'We are more liable to be in doubt than Ibrahim when he said, My Lord! Show me how You give life to the dead'. Allah said, 'Don't you believe' Ibrahim said, 'Yes (I believe), but (I ask) in order to be stronger in faith.' (Bukhari) Abdullah b Abbas while refering that the reason of his request was a doubt which came into his mind; said the following regarding this ayah: 'According to me there is no other ayah than this which gives more hope in the Qur'an.' Meaning even if the slave doubts regarding some issues, this ayah shows that he would not be out of fold of deen and he should seek the ways of preventing from this doubt and this is the most hope giver ayah to the person who is always under attack of delusions of the shaitan. Saed al-Musayyab who narrated this view of Abdullah b Abbas said: Abdullah b Abbas and Abdullah b Amr b al-Ass agreed to meet at a certain place at a certain time. Those days we were young kids. One of them said to the other: 'Which Ayah in the Qur'an carries more hope for you?' Abdullah Ibn Amr said, 'Say: O Ibadi (My servants) who have transgressed against themselves (by committing evil deeds and sins)! Despair not.' (az-Zumar 39/53). Abdullah bin Abbas said, 'if you say this was the ayah that carries the most hope; indeed the following ayah carries more hope than that: 'My Lord! Show me how You give life to the dead. He (Allah) said: 'Do you not

believe" He said: 'Yes (I believe), but to put my heart at ease.' Tabari says that this view is preferable. It is because there is a narration which is narrated from RasulAllah (saw). (Tabari) Ibn Kathir also recorded this and said: "Abdur-Razzaq recorded that Ma'mar said that Ayyub said that Ibn Abbas commented on what Ibrahim said, 'but to be stronger in Faith', 'To me, there is no Ayah in the Qur'an that brings more hope than this Ayah.' Ibn Abi Hatim recorded that Muhammad bin Al-Munkadir said that Abdullah bin Abbas met Abdullah bin Amr bin Al-As and said to him, 'Which Ayah in the Qur'an carries more hope for you' Ibn Amr said, 'Say: O Ibadi (My servants) who have transgressed against themselves (by committing evil deeds and sins)! Despair not.' (az-Zumar 39/53). Ibn Abbas said, 'But I say that it is Allah's statement, 'And (remember) when Ibrahim said, 'My Lord! Show me how You give life to the dead.' He (Allah) said: 'Do you not believe' He (Ibrahim) said: 'Yes (I believe)... Allah accepted Ibrahim's affirmation when he merely said, 'Yes.' This Ayah refers to the doubts that attack the heart and the thoughts that Shaytan inspires.' Al-Hakim also recorded this in Al-Mustadrak and said; its chain is Sahih but they did not record it'." (Tafsir)

5- Ibrahim (as) requested this for his tribe and not for himself. People who adhered to prophets requested sometimes haqq and sometimes baatil. For example the tribe of Musa (as) said: "Fashion for us a god (deity) like unto the gods they have." (al-Araf 7/138). Ibrahim (as) requested this therefore his tribe would witness it and the rejection in their hearts would be destroyed. (Razi)

6- As the ummah of prophets need a miracle that this person is a prophet and not a liar; prophets too need a miracle that the one who came down is an angel and not a shaitan. It is possible that when the angel came to the prophet Ibrahim to announce that he is a prophet, Ibrahim (as) requested a miracle so he believes in certainty that he is a prophet of Allah. He asked: 'My Lord! Show me how You give life to the dead. He (Allah) said: 'Do you not believe' He said: 'Yes (I believe), but to put my heart at ease' that it was an angel and not a shaitan. (Razi)

7- It is possible that Ibrahim (as) learned that one of his grandsons (Isa) will able to resurrect the dead with his prayer, so he also requested the same. (Razi)

8- Allah (swt) commanded Ibrahim (as) to sacrifice his son and he obeyed. Then Ibrahim (as) requested it while uttering: 'You asked me to put life to death and I am asking you to bring the dead to life.' Therefore Allah (jj) asked: 'Do you not believe' He said: 'Yes (I believe), but to put my heart at ease' that You had taken me as Your khalil. (Razi)

9- When Ibrahim (as) looked into his heart and saw that it was as if it was dead because his heart was full of love of his son. He requested ashamedly 'My Lord! Show me how You give life to the dead' meaning when the heart dies because of its ghafalah, how could this heart be resurrected with the dhikr of Allah? (Razi)

10- Meaning of the ayah is: When Ibrahim (as) said: 'All of the living things will witness to gathering on the day of qiyamah. Hence You show me this in this world.' Allah (awj) asked: 'Do you not believe' He said: 'Yes (I believe), but to put my heart at ease' that You give me such honour in this world. (Razi)

11- Intention of Ibrahim (as) was not the resurrection of the dead by Allah. His intention was hearing the kalam of Allah without any intermediary in between. (Razi)

12- Razi concludes the possible reasons with this: Some ignorant people said that: 'Ibrahim (as) was in doubt in both (knowledge of the whence and whither) mabda' (the origin) and ma'ad (the end/return). His doubt regarding mabda' was apparent with the statements "(According to you) this is my Lord" (al-Anam 6/76) and "Unless my Lord guide me, I shall surely be among those who go astray." (al-Anam 6/77). His doubt regarding ma'ad is apparent in this ayah. This view is very weak and moreover it is kufr. It is because the one who does not know that Allah resurrects the dead is kafir. The one who attributes the innocent prophet with this; attributes the prophet with kufr and indeed the one who says this is kafir. Doubting regarding the Power of Allah necessitates doubting regarding the nubuwwah. As a prophet how could he know his own nubuwwah? (Razi)

Regarding the statement of Allah (swt): 'Do you not believe' the following two explanations that had given: 'Hamza which is at the beginning of this statement is istifham-i takrir (type of interrogation where the questioner is intended to confirm). Likewise the poet says: 'Are not you the best of the riders? (Yes you are the best of the riders)'. (The second explanation) Intention with this question is to prove to the people around that he knows and believes it. (Razi)

i- "We are more liable to be in doubt than Ibrahim..."

RasulAllah said: "We are more liable to be in doubt than Ibrahim..." (Bukhari)

Ibn Hajar commented: "The salaf had a difference of opinion regarding what had been meant by "doubt" in the command "We are more liable to be in doubt than Ibrahim..." Some had commented this according to its dhahir and have said this: This matter of doubt happened prior to nubuwwa. In the same manner Tabari had commented this according to its dhahir and had said its reason to the waswasa of the shaitan. However as this waswasa did not make a place it did not surround the sound iman. In this matter Tabari relies on this riwaya narrated by Abd ibn Humayd, Ibn Abi Hatim and Hakim: According to this riwaya Abdulaziz al-Majishun from Muhammad ibn al-Munkadir and him from Ibn Abbas said: The most hope giving ayah surely is the ayah: "When Ibrahim said: 'Show me, Lord, how You will raise the dead' ..." (al-Baqarah 2/260). Ibn Abbas said: This will be in question due to waswasa which is established in the hearts and is given by the shaitan. Allah ta'ala had been content by his answer no (but I wanted my heart to be convinced, to the question or did you not have iman). On the other hand regarding the statement of the Prophet (saw) (the salaf) had different views regarding the meaning of the statement "We are more liable to be in doubt than Ibrahim..." Some of them explained it as such: Our longing to see such thing is much more than Ibrahims' (longing). It is also said the meaning to be as such: If we do not doubt it is much befitting that Ibrahim did not doubt. Also how can doubt reach the prophets? If there was such thing surely I would own more right to doubt. Considering you know that I don't doubt at all, know that he had not doubted either. Him saying such thing is a result of the modesty of the Prophet or he had said such statements before Allah had informed him of him being more virtuous than Ibrahim. This resembles his words mentioned in Muslim narrated by Anas in this hadith: "A man addressed the Prophet (saw) as: O the most khair of the created. RasulAllah had answered (him by stating) that person

is Ibrahim.” According to another explanation the reason of this hadith is this: When the ayah had been revealed some said: Ibrahim doubted. However our nabi did not doubt. When these words reached him he said: We own more right than Ibrahim to doubt. This is similar to the intention of the individual who wanted to set aside a view regarding another along with making such statement by using a custom figure of speech and saying: Whatever you want to tell so and so tell it to me. According to another explanation with his word “us” he had meant his ummah which are permitted to have doubt. The evidence of the Prophet (saw) being kept outside of this is his attribute of ismat (sinless state of the prophets). It is also said the meaning is this: The thing which you see to be doubtful is firstly mentionable regarding me. The reason is it is not a doubt. This only needs extensive explanation. According to narrations by some scholars of the Arabic language ‘afalu’ sometimes could be used to invalidate the matter regarding both of the two things. As in the command of Allah taala in “Are they better than the people of Tubba...” (ad-Dukhan 44/37). Meaning there is no khair in either of them. Again while talking someone would want to say: the shaitan is much khair than such and such however he would have meant to say that there is no khair in either of them. According to this the statement of the Prophet “We are more liable to be in doubt than Ibrahim...” means there is doubt neither in him nor in any of us. When it comes to the command “Yes, but just to reassure my heart” with the observation which will join the itikad in my heart I want my heart to find more serenitand peace. It is because with the support of all the evidence of each other will calm the heart more. As if he answered as such: Yes I confirm yet there is a sensitive meaning in me witnessing. Qadi Iyad stated: Ibrahim did not doubt in the matter of Allah resurrecting the dead. However he wanted his heart to be content and by witnessing the resurrecting incident he wanted to put aside this debate. This way with this assessment he had obtained the first ‘ilm and wanted to learn the second ‘ilm being how this happened and by witnessing it. In the first along with there being no doubt and uncertainty there is also the possibility of wanting the certainty to increase. It is because knowledges can show difference by their strength. For this reason he requested to ascend from ilm al-yakeen (ilm of certainty) to ayn al-yakeen (eye (witnessing) of certainty). Allah knows best.” (Fathu’l Bari 7/69-71)

Qadi Iyad said: “He was distant from the smallest doubt, uncertainty, and hesitation and from not knowing any one of these. He was protected from the opposite of these in full meaning. Regarding the matters we mentioned in ijma of our Prophet (saw) there is the ijma of the Muslimeen. It is stable with certain and clear nass that in the hearts of the prophets it is never true that there is a spec of the mentioned matters. It can not be present. Ibraim (as) had once said this: “And when Ibrahim said (unto his Lord): My Lord! Show me how Thou givest life to the dead, He said: Dost thou not believe? Ibrahim said: Yea, but (I ask) in order that my heart may be at ease.” (al-Baqarah 2/260) By the statement “Yea, but (I ask) in order that my heart may be at ease” in the ayah objection can not be. It is because Ibrahim (as) had not doubted at all by Allah (jj) informing him of resurrecting the dead. However he requested this from Allah to leave the debate, for his heart to be at ease and to witness the resurrection of the dead for himself. This way (with Allah resurrecting the dead) the first ‘ilm (ilm al yakeen/ilm of certainty) had been established, and by witnessing the resurrection of the dead he hoped for the second ilm (ayn al yakeen) (this is the first position). Second position: By requesting this from his Rabb Ibrahim (as) wanted to know that Allah had accepted his dua and wanted to learn his degree before Allah. If it is as such the meaning of Allah taala’s command “Dost thou not believe?” is as such: Do you not attest to the

highness of your place before me, that I have befriended you and that I have chosen you as a prophet”

Third position: In the first ‘ilm (ilm al-yakeen) although there is no doubt and uncertainty he requested to ease his heart and to witness the resurrection of the dead that his ‘ilm to increase (to be ayn al-yakeen). Hence there are advantages of strength among the ‘ilm of amal and the ‘ilm of nazar. It is not possible that doubt and uncertainty comes to ilm of amal. However it is permissible that doubt and uncertainty come to ilm of nazar. Ibrahim (as) requested wanted to transmit from ilm of nazar or from news to observation and from ilm al-yakeen to ayn al-yakeen. News is not like witnessing by eye. For this reason Sahl ibn Abdullah states: Ibrahim (as) requested lifted the curtain from the article with regard to his perception to reach maturity so that the noor of certainty will be greater. The fourth position: Ibrahim (as) had requested this matter from his Rabb so that when he told the mushrik his Rabb killed and resurected as evidence the evidence he had brought would be openly true and clear. Fifth position: Some scholars said: Ibrahim (as) asked by adab “My Lord! Show me how You give life to the dead.” From this it had been meant “Make me capable of resurrecting the dead”. By “to put my heart at ease” it will be made tafsir as so that my heart is content from desiring and wishing this. Sixth position: Ibrahim (as) did not have doubt and uncertainty in his heart however he showed that there is (doubt in his heart) so that his wish is accepted and his closeness to Allah increased. The word of the Prophet (saw) “We are more liable to be in doubt than Ibrahim...” is not a confession that Ibrahim (as) had doubt. On the contrary it is to invalidate he doubted and to distance the belief of those who are weak at heart. When this ayah was revealed some heard it and said Ibrahim doubted our prophet did not doubt. To rid this, our Prophet said: “We are more liable to be in doubt than Ibrahim...” Meaning surely we have faith that after we (the prophet and the group of mu’min) die we will resurrect and Allah will resurrect the dead in its full meaning. If Ibrahim (as) had doubts about this matter we would have come before him in doubting. (The prophet had said this in courtesy towards Ibrahim (as). It is because Ibrahim (as) is a father figure.) Or he had stated it wishing those who have the possibility of doubt within his ummah. Or if it is attributed as modesty or if the story of Ibrahim (as) is attributed to know his own condition or to increase ilm al-yakeen he had said this because he refrained from making tazkiya. If from the command of Allah taala “If thou wert in doubt as to what We have revealed unto thee, then ask those who have been reading the Book from before thee: the Truth hath indeed come to thee from thy Lord: so be in no wise of those in doubt. Nor be of those who reject the signs of Allah, or thou shalt be of those who perish.” (Yunus 10/94-95) you ask what the meaning of the ayati jalil is I will say: Beware (May Allah keep your heart righteous). May nothing (no doubt) come to your heart regarding some mufassir narrating from Ibn Abbas (ra) and another that the Prophet (saw) had doubted that which was revealed to him and that doubt is a necessity of humanity. Things as such regarding the Prophet (saw) are never permissible. Likewise Ibn Abbas (claiming the opposite) had said: “The prophet (saw) had not doubted nor was uncertain.” The same statement was narrated by Ibn Jubayr and Hasan. It had been narrated by Qatada (ra). The Prophet (saw) had stated “I will not doubt nor will I question” (Imam Suyuti, in Manahil 73, quoted from Ibn Hatim who had recorded from Ibn Abbas) Most of the mufassir carry this view. They had ikhtilaf regarding the meaning of the mentioned ayah. Some scholars said this: What had been meant in the ayah is this “O Muhammad! Tell those who doubt and are uncertain” those who make ta’weel of the ayah as such say: In this surah itself there is such an ayah that it guides to ta’weel that is this ayati jalil: “Say: “O ye men! If ye are in doubt as to my religion, (behold!) I worship not what ye worship, other than Allah! But I worship Allah - Who will take your souls (at death): I am

commanded to be (in the ranks) of the Believers” (Yunus 10/104) (Imam Suyuti had recorded in Manahil pg73 that Imam Jarir at Tabari had narrated this hadith) By addressing in the ayah it is narrated as an Arab or from the ummah of the Prophet (saw). Likewise Allah taala commands: “But it has already been revealed to thee,- as it was to those before thee,- ‘If thou wert to join (gods with Allah), truly fruitless will be thy work (in life), and thou wilt surely be in the ranks of those who lose (all spiritual good)’.” (az-Zumar 39/65)” (Ash-Shifa 492-493)

Ibn Qutayba said: “When it comes to the statement of RasulAllah (saw): ‘We are more liable to be in doubt than Ibrahim...’. RasulAllah (saw) said this when some said that Ibrahim (as) doubted but our prophet (saw) did not doubt after the ayah ‘My Lord! Show me how You give life to the dead. He (Allah) said: Do you not believe? He said: Yes (I believe), but to put my heart at ease.’ (al-Baqarah 2/260) had been revealed. RasulAllah (saw) preferred Ibrahim (as) over himself due to his modesty and said: ‘We are more liable to be in doubt than our father Ibrahim (as)’. By this statement of his (saw), he wanted to say: ‘Although we are on a lower rank than his rank; we do not doubt so how could it be possible for him to doubt?’ The meaning of the statement of Ibrahim (as) ‘but to put my heart at ease’ is: to be mutmain (convinced) while seeing the resurrection of the dead in certainty. Certainty is two types: One of these is obtained by hearing; the other certainty is obtained by seeing. The certainty which is obtained by sight is the stronger of these two. For this reason RasulAllah (saw) said when worshipping the calf of the tribe of Musa (as) was mentioned: ‘The thing which is given by news is not the same as that which is seen.’ (Ahmad) Abu Muhammad (said the meaning of this statement of RasulAllah is): When Allah (jj) gave Musa (as) the news that his tribe was worshipping to the calf, Musa (as) did not throw the plates which were in hand. But when he saw them worshipping the calf with his eyes, he got mad with being very angry, he threw the plates and the plates were broken into pieces. Likewise the muminun believe in qiyamah, ba’s (resurrection), jannah, jahannam and all of these are haqq in certainty. On the day of qiyamah when they see and witness it, their certainty will be stronger. Ibrahim (as) requested to put his heart at ease by seeing that is a stronger type of certainty.” (Tawilu Muhtalifil Hadith)

3- Producing doubts from the stories of the wife of Ibrahim (as) and Zakariya (as)

One of the doubts regarding the issue is producing doubts from the stories of the wife of Ibrahim (as) and Zacharia (as) with their amazed expressions towards the tidings regarding bearing a son. It is claimed that although in both incidents both characters have doubts regarding the qudrah of Allah they both still stand as Muslims. Everyone who has an understanding surely knows that this is a great slander and a big lie. We will take both incidents in hand and provide information from the ulamaa and then the weakness of their doubts will clearly be seen inshaAllah.

3a- Amazed Sara

The first ayah which they interfere with is as follows: “And his wife was standing (there) and she laughed: But we gave her glad tidings of Isaac and after him, of Jacob. She said "Alas for me! Shall I bear a child, seeing I am an old woman, and my husband here, is an old man? That indeed would be a wonderful thing!" They said: "Dost thou wonder at Allah's decree? The grace of Allah and His blessings

on you, O ye people of the house! For He is indeed worthy of all praise, full of Glory!" (Hud 11/71-73)

First of all this expression of Sara does not, in any way, suggest that she, instead of feeling happy, considered this prediction the foreboding of a calamity. In point of fact the expression is an exclamation to which women, in particular, resort to in a state of wonder and amazement. Thus, what is intended is not what the questioning the qudrah of Allah but merely expressing the exclamation. She said I am not only old but barren too. How shall a child be born to me? According to the sources, Ibrahim (as) and Sara were at that time around a hundred years old.

Ibn Kathir on the commentary of the ayah said: "She said (in astonishment): 'Woe unto me! Shall I bear a child while I am an old woman, and here is my husband an old man' Allah speaks of her statement in this verse, just as He spoke of her action in another verse. Then his wife came forward with a loud voice: she smote her face, and said: 'A barren old woman!' (az-Dhariyat 51/29) This was the custom of the women in their speech and actions when they were expressing amazement. Then said: 'Do you wonder at the decree of Allah' This means that the angels were saying to her, 'Do not be amazed at the command of Allah, for verily, whenever He wants something, He merely says 'Be' and it is. So do not be amazed at this, even though you are old and barren and your husband is a very old man. Verily, Allah is able to do whatever He wills." (Tafsir)

Qurtubi said: "Sara did not intend cursing herself while stating wayl 'Woe unto me!. This is an expression which is uttered easily by women when they come across an incident they are amazed at. Sara was amazed, because her husband was old and her having a baby was unusual in this condition. Unusual events will be amazed at and found weird. The expression of 'Shall I bear a child' is a question which has the meaning of amazement. 'While I am an old woman' meaning a very old woman. It means 'my age is advanced, I have become old...' Mujahid said during that time Sara was 99 years old. Ibn Ishaq said she was 90 years old. There are views other than these... As it is said that Ibrahim (as) was 120 years old. It was also said that he was 100 years old. According to the view of Mujahid he was only a year older than Sara. It is said that Sara referred indirectly that he does not come near her (touch her sexually)... When Sara fell in amazement saying 'while I am an old woman, and here is my husband an old man' the angels did not accept her amazement regarding the command of Allah they asked: "Do you wonder at the decree of Allah' meaning do you wonder about the hukm of Allah, qadha and qadar of Allah? There is nothing that necessitates amazement because of Allah's bestowing a child on to you." (tafsir)

Regarding her amazement Razi stated: "She was amazed according to the custom and the tradition without taking Allah's qudrah into consideration. Likewise if a trustworthy messenger says to a Muslim that 'Allah will change this mountain to pure gold' without doubt he will be amazed according to the custom and the tradition without finding Allah's qudrah strange. (tafsir)

Samarqandi said: "When the angel gave the good tidings of Ishaq (as) to Ibrahim (as), his wife our mother Sara laughed and said: Woe unto me! Shall I bear a child while I am an old woman, I did not have a child when I was young and shall I bear a child at this age? And my husband is also an old man, how could old people have children? This is something strange. When the angels gave this tiding to Ibrahim

(as) he was 99, mother Sara was 98 years old. It is definitely known that people at that age will not have children however when Allah (swt) made taqdir than His qudrah will not be prevented. He is all-capable! It will become when he says 'Be'. Mother Sara was amazed that she would have a child at that age, angels gave the following as a response to her amazement: "Dost thou wonder at Allah's decree? Allah (awj) declares it: 'Dost thou wonder at Allah's decree o wife of the house? The grace of Allah and His blessings on you, O ye people of the house! For He is indeed worthy of all praise, full of Glory!" (tafsir)

Tabari said: "Sara the wife of Ibrahim (as) was amazed that she shall bear a child. It is because it is reported that, she was 90, Ibrahim (as) was 120 years old." (tafsir)

The second ayah concerning the matter is: "And they (angels) gave him (Ibrahim) glad tidings of a son endowed with knowledge. But his wife came forward clamoring, she smote her forehead and said: 'A barren old woman'" They said 'Even so has thy Lord spoken and He is full of wisdom and knowledge'." (ad-Dhariyat 51/28-30)

Ibn Kathir: "She said: "Woe unto me! Shall I bear a child while I am an old woman, and here is my husband an old man Verily, this is a strange thing!" They said, "Do you wonder at the decree of Allah The mercy of Allah and His blessings be on you, O family of the house. Surely, He (Allah) is All-Praiseworthy, All-Glorious."(11:72-73) Allah said here; and they gave him glad tidings of a son having knowledge. This news was as good to Ibrahim as it was to his wife, for this son would be theirs, and therefore, they both were getting some good news. Allah the Exalted said, 'Then his wife came forward with a loud voice', She screamed loudly, according to Ibn `Abbas, Mujahid, `Ikrimah, Abu Salih, Ad-Dahhak, Zayd bin Aslam, Ath-Thawri and As-Suddi. She said when she shouted, 'Ah! Woe to me!' (25/28), then, she smote her face,' meaning, she struck herself upon her forehead, according to Mujahid and Ibn Sabit. Ibn `Abbas said that she smacked her face just as women do when confronted with an amazing thing, 'and said: "A barren old woman!" meaning, "How can I give birth while I am an old woman And even when I was young I was barren and could not have children," They said: "Even so says your Lord. Verily, He is the All-Wise, the All-Knower", 'He is the All-Knower of the honor that you are worthy of and He is the most Wise in His statements and decisions.'

Qurtubi said: When Sara heard the tidings she smote her forehead. Meaning she smacked her face just as women do when confronted with something amazing. This explanation was made by Sufyan as-Sawri and others...The statement of 'and said a barren old woman' means will a barren old woman give birth? Az-Zajjaj said, it means: She said, I am a barren old woman how can I give birth? Likewise it is reported somewhere else that she said: Woe unto me! Shall I bear a child while I am an old woman? (Hud 11/72)...Sara was barren before this. She gave birth at 99 years old. Ibrahim (as) was 100 years old. This was mentioned before. (Tafsir)

Razi said: "When the angels talked with Ibrahim (as) about his wives delivery, she got embarrassed and left.... But his wife came forward clamoring meaning screaming very loudly. It is because the custom of the women is to scream and shout familiarly when they hear something related with them, when they

were embarrassed or amazed. It could be said that this scream of the wife of Ibrahim (as) is the statement of her: Woe unto me! (Hud 11/72) The proof of this is; this ayah in the surah Hud. Smacking the face is also a custom of women. The wife of Ibrahim (as) saw this abnormal because of these two attributes she had. a) Being very old. b) Being a barren woman... It is because Sara did not give birth when she was young... later she had gotten old and her menstruation had ended. For these reasons she saw it abnormal and as if she thought that it was based from the angels and meant to say: 'I wish you prayed with an acceptable prayer'. This is the same as the statements of a guest who prays stating: 'May Allah give you wealth, may Allah give you children!'. Therefore the angels said: 'This is not a prayer which was prayed by us. This is indeed the hukm and command of Allah'." (Tafsir)

Abu'l-Lays Samarqandi said: "Sara the wife of Ibrahim (as) was servicing them when it was said. She screamed immediately once she heard it. She said with embarrassment and amazement: I did not have a child for all these years shall I bear a son when I am this old? (Tafsir)

3b- The amazement of Prophet Zakariya (as) after the acceptance of His Supplication

The ayah which informs the amazement of Prophet Zakariya (as): "There did Zakariya pray to his Lord, saying: "O my Lord! Grant unto me from Thee a progeny that is pure: for Thou art He that heareth prayer! While he was standing in prayer in the chamber, the angels called unto him: "Allah doth give thee glad tidings of Yahya, witnessing the truth of a Word from Allah, and (be besides) noble, chaste, and a prophet,- of the (goodly) company of the righteous." He said: "O my Lord! How shall I have son, seeing I am very old, and my wife is barren?" "Thus," was the answer, "Doth Allah accomplish what He willeth." (al-i Imran 3/38-40)

Allah granted Zakariya (as) a son despite his old age and despite the barrenness of his wife. And the request is made for some specific sign to be given by means of which Zakariya would come to know in advance when the unusual incident of the birth of a child to a couple, where the male was old and the female both old and barren, would take place.

Ibn Kathir said: "When Zakariya heard the good news, he started contemplating about having children at his age. He said, ("O my Lord! How can I have a son when I am very old, and my wife is barren" (He) said...) meaning the angel said, ("Thus Allah does what He wills" meaning, this is Allah's matter, He is so Mighty that nothing escapes His power, nor is anything beyond His ability. (He said: "O my Lord! Make a sign for me") meaning make a sign that alerts me that the child will come, (Allah) said: "Your sign is that you shall not speak to the people for three days except by signals.") meaning, you will not be able to speak except with signals, although you are not mute. In another Ayah, Allah said, (For three nights, though having no bodily defect.) (Maryam 19/10)" (Tafsir)

Qurtubi said: "He said: "O my Lord! How shall I have son, seeing I am very old, and my wife is barren?"...According to some here the term 'Rabb' (Lord) refers to Jibril. Meaning he asked Jibril: O my Lord (sir)! How shall I have son? This is the view of al-Kalbi. Some of them said: 'O my Lord' refers to Allah. Here the preposition which is used means 'how' and it is a mansub adverb. This way the meaning of the question has been explained in two different ways: According to the first: Will he and his wife have a child in this state or will they be reshaped to

have a child? According to the second explanation he asked this question to find out: Will he have his child from his barren wife or from someone else? According to another explanation its meaning is: How I would be worthy to have a child when I and my wife are in this state? He asked such question while showing modesty. Again according to the narration there was 40 days distance between the time he prayed and the time he had given the good tidings of having a child. He was 90 years old when he had given this tiding. His wife's age was also close to his age. Ibn Abbas and Dahhak said: He was 120 years old when he had given the good tidings of having a child. His wife was 98 years old. This is the meaning of his statement: 'and my wife is barren' meaning she is in a state that can not give birth." (Tafsir)

Razi explained the answer of the question Why did Zakariya (ra) find it as impossible that Allah would give him a child? There are two questions about the ayah of Allah (awj): "O my Lord! How shall I have son?"

First question: The term 'Lord' in the ayah is either an addressing to Allah or the angels. It is permissible for it to be addressing to Allah because the previous ayah shows that the ones who addressed Zakariya were the angels. According to this; this statement should be addressed to the same caller... However it is not permissible for it to address the angels. It is because it is not permissible for a man to call angels as 'O My Lord'? Scholars have two explanations: a) When the angels call Zakariya and gave tidings of Yahya; Zakariya amazed and for isolating this amazement he turned to Allah (and addressed Allah). b) This is a call towards the angels. Here the term 'Lord' refers to the meaning of murabbi (pedagogue/trainer/educator). And it is permissible to address the creature with this term. Likewise it is said 'so and so educates me and treats me well.'

Second question: Although he was the one who requested a child, why was Zakariya amazed and took it to be impossible for him while Allah had accepted his dua?

Answer: His statement was not because he had doubts regarding the qudrah of Allah. There are two proofs regarding it was not that:

a) Everyone knows that a child is created from sperm. It is because if there was a sperm which is not based from a person or a person who has not based from sperm then there would be an uninterrupted succession and it would also necessitate that events were timeless which is impossible. Therefore we understand that we should accept that Allah created a person without sperm or a sperm without a person.

b) Zakariyya requested this from Allah. If it was unfeasible and impossible for him he would not have requested it from Allah. Therefore with these two explanations it is constant that he did not utter "O my Lord, How shall I have son?" because he found it impossible. On the contrary scholars had given some explanations regarding the matter:

1- The term in the ayah carries the meaning 'where, how (come)'. According to this it is possible that the meaning of the ayah is: 'How can you give a child whether usual way or the second unusual way?' It is like that because for Zakariya (as) there are two ways to have a child. First: Youthening by Allah (jj) then give him this child although he is old... According to this the

meaning of the statement “How shall I have a son?” is ‘O Allah whether the usual or the unusual way how shall you give me a son?’ and to him it is said: ‘It is because thus Allah accomplish what He willeth’. This view is the view of Hasan al-Basri and Asamm.

Second: The individual who has lost his hope from something thinks that the possibility for it is very low. But when he witnesses that it happens because of the level of his happiness as if he is horrified (just as the person who says: ‘How did you donate this goods? Why did you want to donate these goods? How can you become consent with donating this much?’ When he sees a person who donates a great amount of goods to him) He’ll say ‘How did this happen? Where did it come from?’ It is the same here. Zakariya (as) thought that it was less possible and when he saw that Allah accepted his prayer, his joy and happiness was raised and this is way he made such statement.

2- When the angels gave the good tidings of Yahya he did not know where he would be blessed from, either the girls side or from his own offspring... For this reason he uttered this statement.

3- When a slave is longing for something and requests it from his master then if his master promises to give whatever he requested, the person who requested will find pleasure to hear the promise; and most of the time for the answer to be repeated he would repeat his request therefore he would find pleasure repeatedly. Thus it is possibly the reason that Zakariya (as) uttered this statement repeatedly.

4- It is narrated from Sufyan ibn Uyayna that he said: The prayer of Zakariya (as) was 60 years before the date he had been given the promise... Thus he forgot his request during that time he had been given the promise. Therefore when he heard such promise during his old age not for his doubts concerning the qudrah of Allah but only the usual manner he found it strange and he thought it is a very low possibility and uttered the statement which is mentioned above.

5- Suddi said that: “When Zakariya (as) heard this promise shaitan came to him told him that this announcement was from the shaitan while saying ‘the one who gave this tidings was the shaitan’; therefore Zakariya (as) mized things to each other for this reason he said: ‘O my Lord! How shall I have son?’ and his intention with this statement was requesting from Allah to show him an ayah that it was not delusion of shaitan but it is wahy and the speech of the angels.” Qadi said: “It is not permissible mixing the angels’ speech with the shaitans’ speech during revelation to the prophets. It is because if we say such thing may happen, the trust towards all the sharee’ah will be lost.” It is also possible to say: When there are miracles regarding deen and correctness of the wahy, then there will be trust that this wahy was undoubtedly from Allah by the angels, shaitan had nothing to do with it. But when it comes to worldly matters and matters of children, miracles mostly do not support it...For this reason without doubt the only possibility of it being from shaitan is left. Therefore surely the person will apply to Allah to take this possibility (of being from the shaitan) out of his mind. (Tafsir)

Tabari said: Although Zakariya (as) was a prophet of Allah how did he utter ‘O my Lord! How shall I have son, seeing I am very old, and my wife is barren?’ Whereas the angels gave him the good tidings that he will have a son. Did Zakariya (as) doubt about the truthfulness of the angels? Whereas this will not even suits a mu’mín slave. Let alone it befitting a prophet? Or did Zakariya

attempt to reject the qudrah of Allah? This is even a greater crime. It is absurd to expect this from Zakariya. As an answer it is said: Regarding this matter Suddi and Ikrimah said the following: 'After the angels gave the good tidings to Zakariya regarding him having a son, the shaitan came to him and told him that the messengers who gave the good tidings were not the messengers of Allah but these words had been uttered by the shaitan; therefore Zakariya requested to clear the issue for getting rid of the doubt which was put into his mind and asked the question which was mentioned in the ayah. Tabari said: "Here Zakariyya (as) might ask this question to learn from whom he will get his son who is promised to him; from his barren wife or any other woman. According to some scholars, Zakariya (as) had asked this question, not because of doubting the promise of Allah but rather to strengthen the promise. Therefore Allah (swt) commanded regarding the question of Zakariya: 'Thus. As Allah created you before you were created from nothing, Allah will give you a son although your wife is barren and you are old.' (Tafsir)

This incident also had been mentioned in surat al-Maryam: "(This is) a recital of the Mercy of thy Lord to His servant Zakariya. Behold! he cried to his Lord in secret, Praying: "O my Lord! infirm indeed are my bones, and the hair of my head doth glisten with grey: but never am I unblest, O my Lord, in my prayer to Thee!" (Maryam 19/2-4)

Ibn Kathir: "He said: 'My Lord! Indeed my bones have grown feeble...' meaning, 'I have become weak and feeble in strength.' and 'gray hair has Ashta`al on my head', means the gray hair has burned into the black hair. The intent is to inform of weakness and old age, and its external and internal traces. Concerning Allah's statement, 'and I have never been unblessed in my invocation to You, O my Lord!' This means, "I have not experienced from You except that You would respond to my supplication and that You would never refuse me in whatever I ask of You." Concerning His statement, 'And verily, I fear Mawali after me,' Mujahid, Qatadah and As-Suddi, all said, "In saying the word Mawali, he (Zakariyya) meant his succeeding relatives." The reason for his fear was that he was afraid that the generation that would succeed him would be a wicked generation. Thus, he asked Allah for a son who would be a Prophet after him, who would guide them with his prophethood and that which was revealed to him. 'He said: My Lord! How can I have a son, when my wife is barren, and I have reached the extreme old age' He said: 'Thus your Lord says: `It is easy for Me. Certainly I have created you before, when you had been nothing!'" (Maryam 19/8-9]

His amazement after the acceptance of His Supplication

Zakariya was amazed when his supplication was answered and he was given the good news of a son. He became extremely overjoyed and asked how this child would be born to him, and in what manner he would come. This was particularly amazing because his wife was an old woman who was barren and had not given birth to any children in her entire life. Even Zakariya himself had become old and advanced in years, his bones had become feeble and thin, and he had no potent semen or vigor for sexual intercourse. The Answer of the Angel (He said:) That is, the angel, in his response to Zakariya and his was amazement. 'Thus says your Lord: `It is easy for Me...' Meaning the birth of the son will be from you and from this wife of yours and not from any other (woman) (easy). Meaning, it is simple and easy for Allah to do. Then he (the angel) mentioned to him that which is more amazing than what he was asking about. The angel said that

the Lord said, 'Certainly I have created you before, when you had been nothing!' This is similar to Allah's statement, 'Has there not been over man a period of time, when he was not a thing worth mentioning' (76/1) He [Zakariya] said: 'My Lord! Appoint for me a sign.' He said: "Your sign is that you shall not speak unto mankind for three nights, though having no bodily defect. 'Then he came out to his people from the Mihrab and he indicated to them by signs to glorify [Allah] in the morning and in the afternoon.'

The Sign of the Pregnancy

Allah, the Exalted, informed about Zakariya that he said, 'He (Zakariya) said: My Lord! Appoint for me a sign.' Give me a sign and a proof of the existence of that which You have promised me, so that my soul will be at rest and my heart will be at ease with Your promise. Similarly Ibrahim said, 'My Lord! Show me how You give life to the dead. He (Allah) said: "Do you not believe" He said: "Yes (I believe), but to put my heart at ease.' (al-Baqarah 2/260)" (tafsir)

Samarqandi said: "O my Lord! infirm indeed are my bones, and the hair of my head doth glisten with grey How shall I have son?" Zakariya (as) did not doubt regarding the qudrah of Allah however he wanted to be convinced like Ibrahim (as) did. For this reason he said: 'I am very old, and my wife is barren' Allah (swt) responded to him: 'Thus, was the answer, Your Rabb commanded that it is very easy for Me. Earlier when you were not created We created you. Your Lord gives life to dried tree and brings fresh fruits out of it. He resurrects the dead, He created from nothing, Your Lord is all-mighty.'" (Tafsir)

Tabari said: "He said: 'O Lord How shall I have son? My wife is barren and I am in a state that the end of old age. Will You give me the child by strengthening me and changing my wives situation so she can deliver a baby? Or will You let me marry with another woman? Without doubt You are all-mighty.' It is understood from here that; Zakariya (as) did not find it strange to be given a child but he was curious about the way the child shall given to him. Also while he was requesting a son he knew and stated that he was an old man and his wife was barren. For this reason it is not possible for him to find the glad tidings of having a child strange." (Tafsir)

Razi said: "The scholars had ikhtilaf regarding who called 'O Zakariya'. Most of the scholars are in the opinion that it was Allah... Some others claim that the call was addressed by the angel...

Does stating 'How shall I have son?' suit the mu'min?

1- Why was Zakariya (as) amazed by uttering 'shall I have son?' although he had requested a child?

2- He was not uttering 'shall I have son?' in public. It is because he was hiding such things from his ummah. Therefore this shows that he said this to himself. Therefore this amazement indicates the doubt of Zakariya (as) regarding the qudrah of Allah which is kufr. Kufr is not permissible regarding the prophets.

Answer: We can give such answer for the first one: According to those who believe that Zakariya (as) did not request a child, this question is baseless. But according to those who

believe that he requested a child, such answer can be said: From the statement of Allah (awj) 'how shall I have son?' the following is mentioned: This is an amazement which refers questioning to get information and not astonishment regarding whether Allah will give them meaning Zakariya and his wife by youthening them or will He give them by keeping them in their state although they are old. The proof of it is the ayah of Allah: "And (remember) Zakariya, when he cried to his Lord: "O my Lord! Leave me not without offspring, though thou art the best of inheritors." So We listened to him: and We granted him Yahya: We cured his wife's (Barrenness) for him.' (al-Anbiya 21/89-90) The term 'isla' which is mentioned in this verse means to give her power of having a child. Its explanation was mentioned. Suddi stated this as another answer: When Zakariya (as) heard the announcement of good tidings of a child, shaitan came to him and said: 'This speech is not from Allah. On the contrary this is from a shaitan which pesters you.' When Zakariya (as) doubted, he uttered this statement meaning: 'How shall I have son?' Intention of Suddi with this explanation is: if Zakariya (as) had certainly known that the one who addressed to him was Allah (swt) it would not be permissible for him to utter it. Therefore he uttered it for this reason.

The Certainty of Wahy

Some of the ahl kalam said: This view is ceratinly wrong. It is because if the prophets permitted some of the things may come from the shaitan which came to them from Allah, they might permit the same thing for other things also. In this case we would lose our belief towards the things that they brought us as wahy. This can be answered as: Such possibility can be at the beginnning of the matter but this possibility will be perished by the miracles of the prophets... (tafsir)

The last ayah related the issue is: "And (remember) Zakariya, when he cried to his Lord: "O my Lord! leave me not without offspring, though thou art the best of inheritors." So We listened to him: and We granted him Yahya: We cured his wife's (Barrenness) for him. These (three) were ever quick in emulation in good works; they used to call on Us with love and reverence, and humble themselves before Us. (al-Anbiya 21/89-90)

Ibn Kathir: "Allah tells us of His servant Zakariya, who asked Allah to grant him a son who would be a Prophet after him. The story has already been given in detail at the beginning of Surah Maryam and also in Surah Ali Imran. Here an abbreviated version is given. (when he cried to his Lord) means, in secret, hiding it from his people. (O My Lord! Leave me not single,) means, with no child and no heir to stand among the people after me. (though You are the Best of the inheritors.) This is a supplication and form of praise befitting the topic. Allah says: (So We answered his call, and We bestowed upon him Yahya, and cured his wife for him.) Ibn `Abbas, Mujahid and Sa`id bin Jubayr said: "She was barren and never had a child, then she gave birth." (Verily, they used to hasten on to do good deeds,) means, acts of worship and acts of obedience towards Allah. (and they used to call on Us with hope and fear,) Ath-Thawri said, "Hoping for that (reward) which is with Us and fearing that (punishment) which is with Us." (and they were Khashi`in before Us.) `Ali bin Abi Talhah reported from Ibn `Abbas that this means, sincerely believing in that which was revealed by Allah. Mujahid said: "Truly believing." Abu Al-`Aliyah said: "Fearing." Abu Sinan said: "Khushu` means the fear which should never leave our hearts." It was also reported from Mujahid that the Khashi`in are those who are humble." Al-Hasan,

Qatadah and Ad-Dahhak said, "The Khashi`in are those who humble themselves before Allah." All of these suggestions are close in meaning." (Tafsir)

4- Doubts related with Ibrahim (as) and the sky objects

"So when the night over-shadowed him, he saw a star; said he: Is this my Lord? So when it set, he said: I do not love the setting ones. Then when he saw the moon rising, he said: Is this my Lord? So when it set, he said: If my Lord had not guided me I should certainly be of the erring people. Then when he saw the sun rising, he said: Is this my Lord? Is this the greatest? So when it set, he said: O my people! Surely I am clear of what you set up (with Allah). Surely I have turned myself, being upright, wholly to Him Who originated the heavens and the earth, and I am not of the polytheists." (al-Anam 6/76-79)

One other doubt occurs in the mind of the evil hearted people is regarding the statements of Ibrahim (as) about the sky objects. Although scholars of Islam made various ta'weel and explanations concerning the issue, they try to emphasize the idea that even though Ibrahim (as) worshipped the sky objects he did not become kafir due to his ignorance.

In the group of ayah which informs about the incident it is shown that the mental experience of Ibrahim (as) he went through to understand the truth. This happened at the beginning of the era he sought the truth which was bestowed on him before prophethood. This unique experience shows how a right-thinking and sound-hearted man, who had opened his eyes in a purely polytheistic environment and had received no instruction in monotheism, was ultimately led to discover the truth by careful observation of and serious reflection on the phenomena of the universe. The account of the conditions prevailing among the people of Ibrahim (as) shows that when he began to think seriously the scene was dominated by the worship of the sky objects such as the moon, the sun and the stars. It was natural, therefore, that when Ibrahim (as) began his quest for the truth, he should have been faced with the question: Is it possible that any of these sky objects is Allah? He concentrated his reflection on this central question and by observing that all the gods of his nation were bound by a rigid law under which they moved about like slaves, he concluded that those so-called gods were not possessed of even a shadow of the power of the One True Lord Allah; Who alone had created them all and had yoked them to serve His will.

The ulama of Islam also mentioned that Ibrahim (as) had never worshipped the fake gods of his tribe nor believed that some of the sky objects might be deities. However he had questioned all these sky objects and said: 'could the sun/moon/stars etc. my Lord? (due to your claim)?' Some among the ulama stuck to the view that the intention of Ibrahim (as) was to mock his nation when he uttered it. I am going to quote explanations of the ulama to get rid of the doubts concerning this issue inshaAllah.

In the tafsir of this ayah the following is stated in the tafsir which is attributed to Ibn Abbas (ra): "Thus did We show Ibrahim the kingdom of the heavens and the earth that which is between the heavens and the earth: the sun, the moon and the stars when he came out of the hole into which he was thrown (that he might be of those possessing certainty) that he might be of those who acknowledge that Allah is One, the Creator of the heavens and the earth and all that which is in them; it is also said that Allah showed him this on the night He made him ascend to heaven. He

saw up to the seventh heaven and the seventh earth, so that he may have the certitude of inspiration: When the night grew dark upon him in the hole (he beheld a star) the planet Venus. 'He said: This is my Lord' could this be my Lord? 'But when it set' when its colour changed to red and it disappeared, 'he said: I love not things that set' I do not love a lord that is not lasting. And when he saw the moon uprising, he exclaimed: 'This my Lord' could this be my Lord? This is bigger than the first one. 'But when it set, he said: Unless my Lord guide me' unless my Lord makes me firm on guidance, 'I surely shall become one of the folk who are astray' from guidance. And when he saw the sun uprising filling everything [with its light], 'he cried: This is my Lord!' Could this be my Lord? 'This is greater!' This is bigger than the first and the second. 'And when it set' when it disappeared, Ibrahim said: I do not love a lord who is not lasting. If Allah does not guide me, I shall be of those who err. It is also said that Ibrahim said 'this is my Lord' mocking his people, for his people worshipped the sun, the moon and the stars. He therefore objected to such worship by mocking them, saying to them: could the like of these be a Lord? When he emerged from the hole and went to his people-he was then 17 years old-he looked at the sky and the earth and then said: my Lord is Him Who has created this. He then proceeded until he found a group of his people attending with devotion to their idols, 'he exclaimed: O my people! Lo! I am free from all that ye associate (with Him)) of idols.' (Tanwir al-Miqbas min Tafsir Ibn Abbas)

Ibn Kathir said "When the night overcame him' covered him with darkness, 'He saw a Kawkab' a star 'He said: This is my lord.' But 'when it Afala', meaning, set, he said, 'I like not those that set.' Qatadah commented, "Ibrahim knew that his Lord is Eternal and never ceases." 'When he saw the moon rising up, he said: This is my lord.' But when it set, he said: 'Unless my Lord guides me, I shall surely be among the misguided people.' When he saw the sun rising up, 'he said: This is my lord.' this radiating, rising star is my lord, 'This is greater' bigger than the star and the moon, and more radiant. 'But when it Afalat' set, 'he said: O my people! I am indeed free from all that you join as partners in worship with Allah. Verily, I have turned my face..', meaning, I have purified my religion and made my worship sincere, 'towards Him Who has created the heavens and the earth,' Who originated them and shaped them without precedence, (Hanifan) avoiding Shirk and embracing Tawhid. This is why he said next, 'and I am not of the idolators.' We should note here that, in these Ayat, Ibrahim, peace be upon him, was debating with his people, and explaining to them the error of their way in worshipping idols and images. In the first case with his father, Ibrahim explained to his people their error in worshipping the idols of earth, which they made in the shape of heavenly angels, so that they intercede on their behalf with the Glorious Creator. His people thought that they are too insignificant to worship Allah directly, and this is why they turned to the worship of angels as intercessors with Allah for their provisions, gaining victory and attaining their various needs. He then explained to them the error and deviation of worshipping the seven planets, which they said were the Moon, Mercury, Venus, the Sun, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn. The brightest of these objects and the most honored to them was the Sun, the Moon then Venus. Ibrahim, may Allah's peace and blessings be on him, first proved that Venus is not worthy of being worshipped, for it is subservient to a term and course appointed that it does not defy, nor swerving right or left. Venus does not have any say in its affairs, for it is only a heavenly object that Allah created and made bright out of His wisdom. Venus rises from the east and sets in the west where it disappears from sight. This rotation is repeated the next night, and so forth. Such an object is not worthy of being a god. Ibrahim then went on to mention the Moon in the same manner in which he mentioned Venus, and then the

Sun.” (Tafsir)

Qurtubi stated: There are different views regarding the statement ‘Is this my Lord?’. Ibrahim (as) uttered it when he was a kid and was not responsible to think, before the time he saw the evidences concerning this matter. In this state such behavior would not be iman or kufr... Some others said: Such riwayat is not sahih. It is not possible that there will be a time period which a person who is sent as a prophet by Allah (jj), who does not make tawhid of Allah, he does not recognize Him, he does not keep far away from every deity other than Allah and he does not cut relationship with him. Also how can such thing be thought regarding someone to whom Allah keep him away from shirk, and lead him to the right path and gave him hidayah since before; show him sovereignty of the earth and skies for his being among those who have certain knowledge? It would not be permissible to attribute him with not knowing Allah. On the contrary he recognized Allah since his first sight. Az-Zajjaj said: According to my opinion, this answer is wrong and it is a mistake of the owner of the speech. It is because Allah (awj) informed us that Ibrahim (as) said the following: ‘O my Lord! preserve me and my sons from worshipping idols.’ (Ibrahim 14/35) Again Allah (swt) commands in another place: ‘Behold! he approached his Lord with a sound heart.’ (as-Saffat 37/84) Meaning he did not associate partners to Allah in any way. Az-Zajjaj continues and says: According to my opinion the answer is this ‘He said according to your statement this is my Lord.’ It is because they were worshipping the idols, the sun and the moon. Similar of this is the following command: ‘Where are My partners’ (an-Nahl 16/27) Whereas Allah (swt) is the One who has no partner, He is One and Only. Meaning of the statement is, ‘Where are My partners whom are My partners according to you?’ It is also said: When Ibrahim (as) came out from the cave during his seeking His Rabb, he saw the light of the star and thought that it was the light of His Rabb. For this reason he said: ‘This is my Lord’ meaning this is His light which is seen to me. He understood that it was not his Lord ‘when it set’. ‘Then when he saw the moon rising,’ and looked its light ‘he said: Is this my Lord?’ ‘When it set, he said: If my Lord had not guided me I should certainly be of the erring people. Then when he saw the sun rising, he said: This is my Lord (according to your claim)’ Uttering such is not shirk. He attributed light to his Lord. But when it set, ilm showed him that it was not worthy to be Lord therefore he comprehend with his heart that it will not be Lord, it also has a Lord over itself, there is no possibility for it being a Lord. It is also explained: The statement of Ibrahim (as) ‘this is my Lord’ was for establishing evidence against his nation. He showed them he thinks accordingly in dhahir. But when the star set he put the evidence and said: ‘it is not possible for anything to be Lord which is set’. Whereas his tribe was revering to the stars, worshipping to the stars, and give hukm accordingly to the stars. An-Nahhas says: The best explanation concerning this matter is the explanation of Ibn Abbas, which is narrated with a sahih chain, regarding the ayah: ‘Light upon Light!’ (an-Nur 24/35) This way the heart of mu’min recognizes and knows Allah (awj) and brings evidences to Him with his heart. When he recognizes and knows Allah (awj) then added light upon his light. As you see, Ibrahim (as) also the same. When he knew Allah (swt) with his heart, brought evidences regarding existence of Him, he knew certainly that there is a Lord and Creator of himself. When Allah (jj) established Himself to him, his marifah regarding Allah was raised and stated: ‘(Come) ye to dispute with me, about Allah, when He (Himself) hath guided me?’ (al-Anam 6/80) It is also explained as: This refers to a questioning and admonishing which is a tone of rejection regarding whatever they do. Meaning: ‘Was this my Lord?’ Or it has the meaning of ‘How could someone as such be a Lord?’ and the preposition of question was to eliminate. Likewise in the Qur’an it is stated in some where else: ‘if then thou

shouldst die, would they live permanently?’ (al-Anbiya 21/34)... It is also said that the meaning of it is: ‘According to your claim, this is my Lord’. Likewise Allah (swt) commands in some where else: ‘Where are my 'partners'? whom ye imagined (to be such)?’ (al-Qasas 28/74) In another place He commands: ‘Taste thou (this)! Truly wast thou mighty, full of honour!’ (ad-Dukhan 44/49) Meaning you were according to your own opinion. It is also said that the meaning is: ‘You are saying that this is my Lord’. Here ‘you are saying’ was eliminated. Elimination is seen very often in the Qur’an. It is said that the meaning is: ‘This is evidence to my Lord’. (Tafsir)

Tabari said: “When the night over-shadowed him, he saw a star; to show an evidence that it is baatil to worship other than Allah he said to his tribe: ‘Look this is my Lord! So when it set, he said: I do not love the setting ones. The mufasssir (scholars of tafsir) mentioned three different views regarding the intention behind stating Ibrahim (as) ‘my Lord’ to the stars. a) According to a narration which is narrated from Abdullah b Abbas and Muhammad b Ishaq; After Ibrahim (as) hid and grew up in a cave due to Nimrud having killed all the boys, he came out and deemed the stars, moon and sun his Lord in reality and he worshipped them but when he saw their setting, he understood that they are not worthy to be an ilah and he recognized Allah who is mabud, and declared that he put iman to Him. There is a very long story which is narrated from Ibn Ishaq regarding this. b) Some of the ulamaa rejected the first view which is narrated above from Abdullah b Abbas, they said that a prophet won’t fall into such state, if he does then he would be on the same rank with the mushrikeen, it is not possible for Allah to appoint such person as a prophet. They in summary said: ...Ibrahim (as) here stating ‘this is my Lord’ is not because of his acceptance of the stars as his Lord but pretending to bring evidence to his tribe who were worshipping the idols. It is because all of the planets including moon and sun are brighter, more beautiful and more useful than idols which they were worshipping. However although they have such attributes, they are not worthy of being worshipped. It is because they are not things which are stable but things which are setting after awhile. Ibrahim (as) intended to say to his tribe: ‘How can you think that your idols which are simpler than those; who are worthy to be worshipped?’ c) According to some of the ulamaa, when Ibrahim (as) said regarding the star ‘this is my Lord’ intended to say: ‘Is this my Lord?’ and he condemned and opposed to his tribes taking deities such things which are setting. Tabari by showing the following part of the ayah “(Come) ye to dispute with me, about Allah, when He (Himself) hath guided me?” as evidence, implied that the first view should be preferred. (tafsir)

Qadi Iyad said: ‘Interfering with star, moon and sun of Ibrahim (as) took place when he was 15 months old.’ (Shifa, 100)

1- Ikhtilaf regarding the prophets’ infallibility in matters other than conveying the message

The infallibility of all prophets should be understood in the limits of the position of the Messenger and the purpose of the message, that the messenger is a human being who is inspired by Allah; which means that in spite of his human qualities, he has special contact with the heavens by inspiration. So this task needs some characteristics which are found by Allah in all messengers chosen for this task to balance between their human characteristics and their position and special task which they are demanded for. Infallibility, like a miracle, is one of the necessities of the trustfulness of the message and the wisdom of the one who sent all messengers. The messenger is like any ordinary man, physically his body is like all

other people, and as a diligent person he is making consultations, making up his mind, thinking and choosing between many choices in matters that no divine inspiration is given to him. Here he has to act according to his human side; so he may be right and may be wrong. But certainly he is infallible in the topics and cases which are inspired to him from Allah, because if he may forget or be wronged in such cases, people will doubt his message. They do not forget anything that Allah has revealed to them except with regard to matters that have been abrogated. They are also infallible in conveying the Message they do not conceal anything that Allah has revealed to them, for that would be a betrayal and it is impossible to imagine that they could do such thing. One aspect of infallibility is that the Prophets do not forget anything of that which Allah has revealed to them, and thus no part of the revelation is lost.

So infallibility is an original characteristic and a necessary condition in all messengers and it is related with the subject of conveying the message and carrying out their mission.

Shaykhul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said: "The verses which point to the Prophethood of the Prophets indicate that they are infallible with regard to the message that they convey from Allah, so what they convey from their Lord can only be true. This is the meaning of Prophethood and this implies that Allah tells [the Prophet] of the unseen and he tells the people of the unseen. So the Messenger is commanded to call people and to convey the message to them." (Majmoal-Fataawa, 18/7)

Other than this, they are human beings and can make an incorrect judgement, as happened to Dawud (as), who failed to do so, and Allah helped his son Sulayman to come up with the right answer in that particular case.

Abu Hurayrah (ra) reported that he heard RasulAllah (saw) say: 'There were two women, each of whom had a son. A wolf came and carried off the son of one of them, who said to the other, "The wolf has taken your son." The other said, "No, he took your son." They came to Dawud to ask him to judge between them, and he ruled in favour of the older woman. Then they went to Sulayman the son of Dawud and told him what had happened. He said, "Bring a knife and divide the child between them." The younger woman said, "Do not do that, may Allah have mercy on you! He is her son." So Sulayman ruled in favour of the younger woman.' (Bukhari).

Again RasulAllah (saw) stated: "Umm Salamah (raa), the wife of RasulAllah (saw) narrated that he heard a dispute going on at the door of his apartment, so he went out and told them: 'I am no more than a human being. Disputing parties may come to me, and one of you may be more eloquent and persuasive than the other, so I may think that he is telling the truth and rule in favour of him. Whoever has a judgement in favour of him to the detriment of a fellow-Muslim's rights, this is a piece of the Fire – let him take it or leave it.'

Raafi ibn Khadeej said: "RasulAllah (saw) came to Madinah and found them pollinating the palm trees. He said: What are you doing? They said: We always do this. He said: Perhaps if you do not do it that will be better. So they did not do it, and the harvest failed. They told him about that and he said: I am only

human. If I tell you to do something with regard to your religion, and then do it, but if I tell you to do something based on my own opinion, then I am only human.” (Muslim)

Narrated by Abu Sa'id al-Khudri (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) said, "Allah never sends a prophet or gives the Caliphate to a Caliph but that he (the Prophet or the Caliph) has two groups of advisors: A group advising him to do good and exhorts him to do it, and the other group advising him to do evil and exhorts him to do it. But the protected person (Ma'sum) is the one who is protected by Allah." (Bukhari)

Ibn Taymiyyah said: "People have two opinions with regards to the possibility of Prophets committing sins. The Salaf and the majority were of the opinion that this was possible but it was impossible for them to endorse sin. Many people were of the opinion that it was not possible for them to commit sin at all." (Radd al-Bakri 2/622)

When it comes to the idea of the Prophets committing major sins (kabaa'ir), Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said: "...The belief that the Prophets are free of major sins, but not of minor sins, is the opinion of the majority of Islamic scholars and of all (Muslim) groups... It is the opinion of most mufasssireen (commentators on the Qur'an), scholars of hadith and fuqaha. Indeed, nothing has been narrated from any of the salaf, imams, Sahabah, tabi'een and those who followed them except that which is in accordance with this view...What has been narrated from the majority of scholars is that they are not infallible with regard to minor sins, but they are not left to persist therein. They do not say that this does not happen under any circumstances. The first group from whom it was narrated that they are infallible in all cases, and who say that the most, are the Rafidis who say that they are infallible and protected even against forgetfulness and misunderstanding." (al-Fataawa, 4/319-320)

They make mistakes but Allah does not let them persist in their mistakes, rather he points out their mistakes to them as a mercy to them and their nations, and He forgives them for their mistakes, and accepts their repentance by His Grace and Mercy. With regard to whether it is possible for the Prophets to commit minor sins, al-Safarini quoted from Ibn Hamdan who said in Nihaayat al-Mubtadi'een: "They are infallible in conveying the commands and message of Allah, but they are not infallible in any other regard. They may make mistakes, forget things, or commit minor sins – according to the most well-known opinion (of the scholars) – but they will not be approved for these mistakes." (Lawaami' al-Anwaar al-Bahiyyah 2/214)

Ibn Taymiyyah said: "The ummah (Muslim nation) is agreed that the Messengers are infallible in carrying out their mission... As for their infallibility in matters other than conveying the message, the people differ about this: is their infallibility in these matters established via the intellect or via the revelation? Could they commit major or minor sins, if so any or just some? Is it that they are infallible from endorsing sins but not from committing them? Are they infallible only in their conveyance of the revelation? Were they preserved from disbelief and sins before they were commissioned?" (Dua and Tawhid)

The majority of scholars take the following as evidence to support their claim that the Prophets are not

free from minor sins:

Adam's sin in eating from the tree from which Allah had forbidden him to eat. Allah says: "And (remember) when We said to the angels, 'Prostrate yourselves to Adam.' They prostrated (all) except Iblis, who refused. Then We said, 'O Adam! Verily, this is an enemy to you and to your wife. So let him not get you both out of Paradise, so that you be distressed in misery. Verily, you have (a promise from Us) that you will never be hungry therein nor naked. And you (will) suffer not from thirst therein nor from the sun's heat. Then Shaytaan whispered to him, saying: 'O Adam! Shall I lead you to the Tree of Eternity and to a kingdom that shall never waste away?' Then they both ate of the tree, and so their private parts appeared to them, and they began to stick on themselves leaves from Paradise for their covering. Thus did Adam disobey his Lord, so he went astray." (Ta-Ha 20/116-121)

When Nuh prayed for his son who was a kafir that time, Allah rebuked him for doing so, and taught him that this person was not a member of his family, and that this prayer was not a righteous deed on his part. So Nuh sought forgiveness from his Lord, repented and returned to Allah: "Nuh said: 'O my Lord! I seek refuge with You from asking You that of which I have no knowledge. And unless You forgive me and have Mercy on me, I would indeed be one of the losers.'" (Hud 11/47)

When Dawud realized that he had been too quick to judge, without listening to what the second disputant had to say, he hastened to repent: "... and he sought Forgiveness of his Lord, and he fell down prostrate and turned (to Allah) in repentance." (as-Sad 38/24)

Everyone, even the Prophets, is in need of the forgiveness of Allah. Allah has blessed His Prophets by forgiving their sins, and He has blessed our Prophet (saw) as He (awj) said: "That Allah may forgive you your sins of the past and the future, and complete His favour upon you, and guide you on the Straight Path." (al-Fath 48/2)

Ibn Taymiyyah said: "Allah, Exalted is He, frequently mentions the repentance of the Prophets and their asking forgiveness. Adam and his wife said: 'Our Lord! We have wronged ourselves. If You do not forgive us and have mercy on us, we will be among the lost' (al-Araf 7/23) Nuh said: 'My Lord! I take refuge with You from asking You for anything about which I have no knowledge. If You do not forgive me and have mercy on me, I will be among the lost' (Hud 11/47) al-Khalil said: 'Our Lord! Forgive me and my parents and the believers on the Day the Reckoning takes place» (Ibrahim 14/41) "...He who I sincerely hope will forgive my mistakes on the Day of Reckonings.' (ash-Shuara 26/82) Musa said: '...You are our protector so forgive us and have mercy on us. You are the Best of Forgivers. Prescribe for us good in this world and the Hereafter, we have truly turned to You' (al-Araf 7/155-156) 'My Lord! I have wronged myself so forgive me...' (al-Qasas 28/16) 'When he regained consciousness he said, 'Glory be to You! I turn to you in repentance and I am the first of the believers' (al-Araf 7/143) Allah (swt) informs us of Dawud that he, 'Begged forgiveness from his Lord and fell down prone, prostrating, and repented' (Sad 38/24-25) Sulayman said: 'My Lord! Forgive me and give me a kingdom the like of which will never be granted to anyone after me. Truly You are the Ever-Giving' (Sad 38/35) As for Yusuf, the sincerely truthful, Allah did not mention any sin of his, and this is why no mention is made of repentance from him, instead He said:

‘That happened so We might avert from him all evil and lust. He was Our chosen servant’ (Yusuf 12/24) So He informed us that he turned evil and indecency away from him and this proves that he committed neither. As for His saying ‘She wanted him and he would have wanted her had he not seen the Clear Proof of his Lord’ (Yusuf 12/24) The word 'desire' (hamm) is a generic noun (ism jins) and it falls into two categories as Imam Ahmad said, 'Desire is of two types: a desire that is merely thoughts, and a desire that one commits and persists in.' It is established in the Sahib that RasulAllah (saw) said: ‘When a servant desires to commit a sin, nothing is recorded against him, if he then leaves that sin for the sake of Allah, one good deed is recorded for him, if he commits that sin, one sin is recorded for him, if he leaves that sin, but not for the sake of Allah, no sin or reward is recorded for him.’ So Yusuf (as) had a desire which he abandoned for the sake of Allah and this is why Allah turned him away from evil and indecency by virtue of his sincerity. Hence, this 'turning away' occurs when the cause for committing sin is present, i.e. desire, yet contending with this is one's sincerity to Allah. So Yusuf (as) did nothing except good deeds for which he would be rewarded for, Allah (awj) says: ‘As for those who have taqwa, when they are bothered by visitors from Satan, they remember and immediately see clearly’ (al-Araf 7/201) As for what is reported that he untied his lower garment and they both got into the position for intercourse at which point he saw the image of Ya`ciab biting his hand, and the likes of these reports, none of them have been told us by Allah or His Messenger. Hence such reports were taken by the Muslims from the Jews who are the greatest liars against the Prophets and the most severe in accusing them. As for His saying: ‘I do not say that my self was free from blame, the self indeed commands to evil acts - except for those my Lord has mercy on’ (Yusuf 12/53) these are the words of the wife of al-Aziz as is clearly proven by the Qur'an: ‘The king said, 'Bring him to me straight away!' But when the envoy came to him, he said, 'Go back to your master and enquire of him what happened about the women who cut their hands. My Lord has knowledge of their cunning guile.' He said, What was this past affair of yours when you solicited Yusuf?’ Then they said, 'Allah forbid! We know no bad of him.' The governor's wife then said, 'The truth has now emerged. Indeed I tried to seduce him then and he has simply told the honest truth. In this way he may know at last that I did not dishonour him behind his back and that Allah most surely does not guide the deviousness of the dishonourable. I do not say that my self was free from blame, the self indeed commands to evil acts - except for those my Lord has mercy on' (Yusuf 12/50-53) All of these are the words of the wife, for Yusuf was still in prison at that time not yet having had an audience with the king, but in his absence his innocence was finally established upon which the king said: ‘Bring him to me straight away so I may draw him very close to me.’ When he spoke to him, he declared, 'Today you are trusted, established in our sight’ (Yusuf 12/54) Many exegetes mentioned these words 64 to be the words of Yusuf, and some of them only mentioned this opinion. This opinion is totally false and has no evidence to support it, indeed the evidences prove the opposite. These matters have been detailed in other places. The point of this discussion is to show that all that is contained in the story of Dha-n-Nan for which he could be censured for, is all forgiven, and furthermore, Allah altered it all to good deeds and raised his ranks. He was in a much better state after coming out of the belly of the whale and his repentance than he was before. Allah (jj) says: ‘So wait steadfastly for the judgment of your Lord and do not be like the Companion of the Fish when he called out in absolute despair. Had a blessing from his Lord not overtaken him, he would have been thrown up on the naked shore, for he was at fault. But his Lord chose him and made him one of the righteous’ (al-Qalam 68/48-50) This was different to his state when he was in the belly of the whale: ‘I do not say that my self was to blame...’Then the fish devoured

him and he was to blame' (as-Saffat 37/142) So in this state he was blamed, but he was not in this state when taken out of the belly of the whale, hence his condition after saying: 'None has the right to be worshipped save You; glory be to You, far removed are You from any imperfection; I have been amongst the wrong-doers' (al-Anbiya 21/87) was better than his state before. What is taken into consideration is the perfection of the end state, not what may have occurred in the beginning. Actions are by their conclusions. Allah (swt) created man and took him out of the belly of his mother knowing nothing. Then He taught him and transferred him from a state of deficiency to a state of perfection, hence it is not permissible to judge the worth of man based on his initial state, rather on his final state. Yunus (as), and other Prophets, in their final states were in the most perfect of states. It is from this perspective that those who thought the Angels better than the Prophets and righteous erred. They compared the perfection of the Angels with the initial stages of the righteous and their deficiencies, were they to have compared the two after the righteous entered Paradise and their having attained the pleasure of the All-Merciful and the removal of all defects, when they are in the state that, 'angels will enter in to welcome them from every gate: 'Peace be upon you because of your steadfastness! How wonderful is the Ultimate Abode!' (al-Rad 13/23-24) were they to have made the comparison in this state the excellence of this state over the state of all other objects of creation would have been clear. As for what some people presume, that one who is born into Islam and never leaves it is better than one who was a disbeliever and then accepted Islam, this is not correct. What is considered is the conclusion, whichever of the two has more faunal of Allah at the end is the better of them. It is known, for example, that the Forerunners from amongst the Muhajiran and Amax - i.e. those who accepted Islam after having been disbelievers - are better than those who came after them who were born into Islam, be they of their own offspring or others. Indeed someone who has tasted evil and known it and then tastes good and knows it, could well discern the good better, love it more, and hate the evil more than those who have not tasted evil. Indeed the one who has known nothing save good could come across evil and not recognize it and either fall into it or not reject it with the same fervor as the one who has previously experienced it...The Prophets, may Allah send peace and blessings upon them, would never delay repentance, rather they would rush to it and compete in doing so. They would never delay and they would never persist in committing a sin, indeed they are preserved from this. Whoever amongst them did delay repentance slightly was tried by Allah so as to serve as expiation for the delay as was done with Dhu-n-Nun, may Allah's peace and blessings be upon him. This according to the opinion of those who stated that he was put in the whale of the belly after being commissioned as a Prophet, as is the famous opinion; in the opinion of those who opine that this was before his prophethood, this explanation is not required. The one who has repented from disbelief and sin could be better than one who has not fallen into disbelief or sin. If it is possible that he be better, the best is more deserving of a Prophet; Allah informs us of the brothers of Yusuf and their sins, yet they became the leaders of the tribes and Allah commissioned them as Prophets...Allah, Glorious is He, informs us of the repentance of Adam, Nah, and those who came after them until the Seal of the Messengers, Muhammad O. From amongst the last verses to be revealed to him, or the last verses to be revealed to him, were, 'When Allah's help and victory have arrived and you have seen the people entering Allah's religion in droves, then glorify your Lord's praises and ask His forgiveness, He is the Ever-Returning' (an-Nasr 110/1-3) The Two Sahihs record the hadith of Aishah (raa) that RasulAllah (saw) would frequently say in his bowing and prostration: 'Glory be to You, O Allah, our Lord, far removed are You from any imperfection, all

praise and thanks are due to You. O Allah! Forgive me. Thereby implementing the Qur'an.' Before this verse, Allah revealed: 'Allah has turned towards the Prophet and the Muhallirfin and the Ansar, those who followed him at the time of difficulty, after the hearts of a group of them has almost deviated, then He turned towards them - He is All-Gentle, Most Merciful to them' (at-Tawbah 9/117) (Bukhari; Muslim) 'O People! Turn to your Lord in repentance, for by the One in whose hand is my soul, I ask Allah's forgiveness and turn to him in repentance more than seventy times.' (Bukhari; Tirmidhi) Muslim has the hadith on the authority of al-Agharr al-Muzani that RasulAllah said, A shadow crosses my heart and I ask Allah's forgiveness one hundred times a day." (Muslim; Abu Dawud) The sunnan have the hadith on the authority of ibn 'Umar who said, We would count RasulAllah saying, 'My Lord! Forgive me and turn to me, You are the Oft-Returning, the Forgiving' one hundred times in one sitting." (Abu Dawud; Tirmidhi; Bukhari, Adab al-Mufrad; Nasai; Amal Sahih by al-Baghawi, Ibn Hibban) The Two Sahihs record the hadith on the authority of Abu Miasd that RasulAllah would say, 'O Allah! Forgive me my error, my ignorance, my transgression in my affairs and all that which You know better than I. O Allah! Forgive my jesting, my solemnity, and my mistakes - both intentional and unintentional - for all of them are from me.' (Bukhari; Muslim) 'O Allah! Forgive me my past and future sins, what I did secretly and what I did openly, and all that which You know better than I You are the one who brings forward and leaves behind and You are the Omnipotent.' The Two Sahihs record the hadith on the authority of Abu Hurayrah who asked RasulAllah about what he said in his period of silence between the opening takbir for prayer and his recitation, he replied, 'I say: O Allah! Distance my sins from me in the same way as You have distanced the east from west. O Allah! Cleanse me of my sins in the same way that a white garment is cleansed of dirt. O Allah! Wash my sins from me with water, ice and snow.' Muslim and others record that he would say a similar supplication upon raising his head from the rukfit.' Muslim records the hadith on the authority of 'Ali that the Prophet would say in the opening supplication for prayer, O Allah! You are the King, there is none worthy of worship save You. You are my Lord and I am your servant. I have wrought evil so forgive me for none" forgives sins save You. Guide me to the best morals and manners for none guides me to them save You; turn me away from evil morals and manners for none turns me away from them save You.' Muslim records the hadith that the Prophet would say in his sajdah: 'O Allah! Forgive me all my sins, the small and great, the open and secret, the first and last.' (Muslim; Abu Dawud) The sunnan record the hadith on the authority of Ali that RasulAllah was brought an animal to ride whereupon he praised Allah and said, 'Glory be to Him who has subjected this to us. We could never have done it by ourselves and indeed we are returning to Our Lord' (az-Zukhruf 43/13-14) Then he praised Him and exalted Him and said, 'Glory be to You! I have wronged myself, so forgive me for none forgives sins save You.' Then he smiled and said, 'The Lord is well pleased with His servant when he says, 'Forgive me for none forgives sins save You,' He says, 'My servant knows that there is none who forgives sins save Me.' (Muslim; Abu Dawud) Allah (awj) says, '...and ask forgiveness for your wrongdoing, and for the men and women who are believers' (Muhammad 47/19) 'Truly We have granted you a clear victory, so that Allah may forgive you your earlier sins and any later ones' (al-Fath 48/1-2) Go to Muhammad, a servant whose past and future sins have been forgiven by Allah' The Prophet would stand [in prayer] until his feet would swell and it was asked of him, 'Why do you do this when Allah has forgiven your past and future sins?' He replied, 'Should I then not be a grateful servant?' One can also ask for forgiveness and repent for leaving the best course, so whoever moves to a state better than the one he was in previously could repent from his previous state; however censure and threat can only

exist for sin. Allah knows best.” (Dua and Tawhid)

Ibn Taymiyyah said: "There is a well known ikhtilaf regarding the fact that Shuayb and other prophets had never been from the ummah kufr. In any case this hukm necessitates evidence of naql and aql. There is no evidence in the Book, sunnah or ijma. And there is ikhtilaf regarding the evidence of aql. According to the view preferred by the ahl sunnah in regards to aql there is no evidence concerning this matter and aql in this matter does not necessitate any view. The real ikhtilaf is between the mutaahhir ahl sunnah scholars and the mutazilah. After Qadi Abu Bakr ibn Hatib asked the following questions 'is it permissible for prophets to sin? If it is permissible what sort of sin is permissible? Is this prior to prophethood or in the same sense permissible after also?' By correctly answering he said: "as we mentioned previously because the prophets are dawah officers of Allah, their keeping distant from everything which will shadow the miracle they brought, and due to the high degree and rank Allah had given them they are certainly distant from negativities such as lying, hiding wahy, mistake, erratum, delusion, to cover up." "People had ikhtilaf regarding the matter if prophets would perform sin or not. The sect of Mutazila said: Prior to or after prophethood it is not possible for prophets to commit minor or major sin. It is because it is contradictory to people following them and accepting their word. Moreover according to some mutazilah sin being preformed by a prophet means their condition of being dawah officers of Allah comes to an end. Even prior to their prophethood the prophets are mukallaf with following the aqli fard, perform salih amal and follow the sharee'ah of the prophet before them." I say: Most of the scholars such as Ibn Anbari, Zujaj, Ibn Atiyya, Ibn Jawzi and Baghawi state: Even before their prophethood the prophets were saved from kufr/ they are innocent. Baghawi stated: The scholars of usul have the view that prior to wahy the prophets were mu'min. The Prophet (saw) prior to wahy would make ibadaah upon the deen of Ibrahim." However this statement of Baghawi and his statement in the tafsir of the following ayah contradict "And He found thee wondering and he gave thee guidance." (Ad Dhuha: 93/7) In the tafsir of this ayah he stated: "The meaning of this ayah Allah had found you wondering and gave you hidayah to His tawhid and nubuwwa." In the same way it also contradicts with this qawli ilahi (statement): "...thou knowest not what scripture was and what was faith..." (As Shura 42/52) It was narrated that Ahmad said: "Whoever is to say that the prophet (saw) was upon the deen of his tribe, this is such evil statement." However Suddi and others stated: " he was upon the deen of his tribe for 40 years." Ibn Abi Hatim narrated: "Abdullah ibn Abu Bakr said to me from Uthman ibn Abu Sulayman ibn Jubayr ibn Jubayr ibn Mutim and he from his uncle Nafi ibn Jubayr ibn Mutim and he from his father Jubayr ibn Mutim narrated: I saw RasulAllah (saw) upon the deen of his tribe" Here we would like to mention regarding the matter of the prophet committing any sin prior to their prophethood has not only been debated among the members of mutazilah but also among the ashab-i hadith and ahl-i sunnah. Abu Bakr ibn Tayb stated: "from the mutazilah, our friends and many from the ahl haq stated: "There is nothing to prevent an individual who has been kafir or committed major sin prior to prophethood to be sent as prophet. As we will explain we also carry this view. However there has been ikhtilaf regarding the fact whether or not they will commit sin after prophethood... Ahl-i Haq stated: "When a minor sin is performed by the prophets they will see it great and by fearing and being horrified they will make tawba istighfar to Allah immediately and request to be forgiven." Baklani continued: "Our preference is this also." Again he stated: "From among the ahl-i haq the majority stated: "Certain hukm can not be given regarding the prophets committing sin during their prophethood. For this evidence is a

must. It is most likely that the ayah and narrations which refer to this matter are regarding their life prior to their prophethood.” Baklani: “This is much suiting and much worthy to their honour of prophethood.” Baklani continued: “The chapter regarding the permissibility of the individual to have performed kufr or major sin prior to prophethood. One of the matters which indicate this is as such: An individual being sent as a prophet indicates his iman, truthfulness, clean spirited, maturity of his ilm, knowing Allah and that he was the individual worthy of this. It is because the truthfulness of what he brings is measured by his truthfulness. The moment he is sent as a prophet, there is no barrier for an individual who has turned from the evil which he could have preformed in the past and an individual with such major cleansing and who gains dignity to become prophet, for people to be commanded to submit and respect him; even if he was a sinner prior to his prophethood! From this the permissibility of the ummah designating an imam who will perform the sharee'ah and law is extracted. Prior to the imam coming to this duty even if they were performing major sin or upon kufr the moment he is brought as an imam to the head of the ummah, as the command of Allah he will be respected and his commands will be implemented. While their rank and status are different the prophets are like this. Another matter which guides us to this is this: There is no barrier for an individual who had been kafir previously and had made tawbah and turned from his kufr to be sent as a prophet.” ...It is not shameful that he is upon the deen of his tribe other than his truthfulness, trustworthiness, performing the known good and abandoning the evil while he is living within a mushrik and ignorant society prior to his prophethood... Therefore among the prophets of the ban-i (sons of) Isra'il there is no prophet who had been mushrik. Contrarily all of them had been raised according to the sharee'ah of the torah. The brothers of Yusuf who had been said to be prophets had sinned and made tawbah prior to their prophethood... The only matter the mushrik had condemned the prophets is their statement: “You were like us”. The response of the prophets to this is very clear: “Yes, because wahy did not come before, as others we were also clueless of these matters.” “They said: You are but mortals like us...” (Ibrahim 14/10) The prophets answered: We are but mortals like you, but Allah giveth grace unto whom He will of His slaves.” (Ibrahim 14/11) Everyone agrees regarding the matter that it is permissible for the individual who has no knowledge or news of nubuwwa and sharee'ah to be sent as a prophet. It is kufr not to attest to such individual after becoming a prophet. The prophets' having no knowledge of these matters does not harm their prophethood. Moreover by Allah teaching them what they do not know He gives the duty of prophethood. Allah commanded: “by His Command doth He send the Spirit (of inspiration) to any of His servants he pleases, that it may warn (men) of the Day of Mutual Meeting.” (al-Ghafir 40/15) “He doth send down His angels with inspiration of His Command, to such of His servants as He pleaseth, (saying): “Warn (Man) that there is no god but I: so do your duty unto Me.” (an-Nahl 16/2).” ...People had ikhtilaf regarding the matter of the lives of our prophets prior to their prophethood and the ayah we mentioned from the surah Araf (88) and Ibrahim (31): Some said: “The prophet (saw) was not upon the deen of his tribe and would not eat what they would slaughter. This statement had been narrated from Ahmad ibn Hanbal. “Whoever is to claim that he was upon the deen of his tribe, this is an evil statement. The prophet (saw) would not eat that which had been slaughtered for the idols.” (Ahmad, Musnad) I say: Ahmad could have said (meant): “The prophet (saw) did not worship idols” however this statement of his has been wrongfully narrated. It is because there are many narrations regarding the prophet (saw) not worshipping the idols. However there aren't any narrations regarding him not eating that which his tribe slaughtered. Let alone among people Ahmad is the one who knew these narrations the best.

Therefore it is not possible that he gives hukm regarding a matter which there is no narration of. The prophet (saw) had informed that this is haraam only after his prophethood. The things slaughtered for the idols being haraam had been mentioned in surah al maida (3). The restriction of that which is slaughtered to other than Allah had been informed in the Meccan surah such as Anam (145) and Nahl (110). This being haraam had been known with the Qur'an. Prior to the revelation of the Qur'an unlike shirk this matter had not been known to be haraam. He (saw) and his Ashab during their entire lives in Mecca had continued to eat the meat they (the mushrik) had slaughtered. However there is a difference between that which is slaughtered for its meat and that which is slaughtered for the idols which is shirk. This has never been mubah with the sharee'ah. It is because this is idol worshipping. However other than this those which are slaughtered for its meat had been permissible like marrying mushrik women in the first era, it had later been restricted (made haraam)... It is not necessary for all prophets to be innocent from sins prior to nubuwwa like him (saw). Just because Allah had shown shirk as evil (ugly) to him (Muhammad saw) it does not necessitate Him (awj) to show shirk as evil other prophets also. The fadhilah and superiority of our prophet (saw) will not harm the fadhilah of other prophets. Just like other people Allah had made some prophets superior to others like in matters of sharee'ah, book and ummah. Allah had informed that Lut had been from the millat-i Ibrahim and had made iman to him. Later He sent him as a prophet. In the same manner while the young man Yusha (Joshua) beside Musa and his brother Harun had been individuals who submitted to him later had become prophets. However the status of both of these (Yusha and Harun) is different from Lut. Prior to them being prophets they had been from the ban-i Isra'il meaning the millat-i Ibrahim. However Lut was from a tribe which there had been no prophets prior to himself. When Allah sent Ibrahim then Lut submitted to him." (Tafsiru ayat'un mushkilat)

5- The Incident of the Disciples of Isa (as)

This doubt is relied upon the following ayah: "Behold! the disciples, said: 'O Jesus the son of Mary! Can thy Lord send down to us a table set (with viands) from heaven?' Said Jesus: 'Fear Allah, if ye have faith.' They said: 'We only wish to eat thereof and satisfy our hearts, and to know that thou hast indeed told us the truth; and that we ourselves may be witnesses to the miracle'." (al-Maida 5/112-113)

According to their claim these people, although had doubts regarding the qudrah of Allah and truthfulness of the nubuwwah of His prophet, were excused due to ignorance. Disciples who were praised by Allah due to their ignorance asked Isa (as): 'Can your Lord send down a table from heaven?' Although they asked this question Allah did not invalidate their iman."

First of all, it must be known that disciples were such people who know Allah and are far away from doubting about Allah. (Qurtubi, Tafsir) Besides this 'none of the ulama said that, they were excused although they doubted regarding the qudrah of Allah and the truthfulness of the nubuwwah.

Some among the scholars prefer the view that they doubted but they made takfir of them because of this doubt and they did not excuse them due to their ignorance.

Most of the scholars have the view that the disciples did not doubt at all. It is because the disciples had clearly known that Allah can send down a table from heaven. This is the preferable view concerning the matter. Ali (ra), Aisha (raa), Ibn Abbas (ra) and Mujahid are on this view. (Qurtubi; Razi; Baghawī)

Most of the mufasssīr ascribe ‘yastatī’a Rabbuka’ (would He send down on us a Table from the heaven?) to ‘tastatī’a Rabbaka’ (Are you able to ask of Him?) (Tafsīr al-Jalalayn; Qurtubi; Razi) While reciting the word Rabb mansub they give this meaning: “Are you able to ask of Him to send down on us a Table from heaven?”

Without doubt they were wise people who were far away from doubting regarding the qudrah of Allah. Also regarding the recitation ‘yastatī’a Rabbuka’ commented that, it means: ‘yastatī’a Would your Lord answer your request and would He perform accordingly? These types of expressions are much known in Arabic.

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) said that the statement of the disciples means: “From this ‘Can thy Lord send down to us a table set (with viands) from heaven?’ should be understood that ‘Did your Lord estimate it in this way?’ Likewise the statement of Yunus (as) is also the same: ‘He imagined that We had no power over him!’ (al-Anbiya 21/87) Meaning he did not realize that We estimated it. As it is said to a person ‘would you estimate to do this? Meaning: can you make it. This is a much known usage in the tongues of people.” (Fatawa, 8/374)

Some of the ulamāa said: Without doubt they doubted regarding the qudrah of Allah and truthfulness of the nubuwwa of His messenger. However this was before the marifah and yaqeen established in their heart. Therefore they say: With this statement of theirs, this tribe became kuffar. Their messengers called them to make tawbah with this: ‘Fear Allah, if ye have faith.’ (Tabari; Razi) This was preferred by Imam Tabari. The following statement of disciples is also the same: ‘to know that thou hast indeed told us the truth’ (al-Maida 5/113) Imam Tabari said that, they were in doubts regarding his risalah. For this reason Tabari preferred the view that they became kafir with this statement.

The majority of the scholars preferred the view which interprets the meaning of this statement as: ‘So our iman will arise on certainty and we will convince concerning your risalah. Without doubt they did not doubt. On the contrary they request miracles which they can observe therefore they convince with regards to certainty, confirmation and sincerity and saved from the delusion and the whisper of the nafs.

When it comes to the ayah: ‘to know that thou hast indeed told us the truth’ (al-Maida 5/113) meaning to see a special miracle. As it is known Arabs use the word see in the place of ilm and vice verse. Qurtubi said the following regarding the ayah which is related with the appointment of Qiblah: “We appointed the Qiblah to which thou wast used, only to test those who followed the Messenger from those who would turn on their heels (From the Faith).” (al-Baqarah 2/143) Ali (ra) said that ‘lenalama’ (know) means ‘lenara’ (see). Arabs use see instead of know; know instead of see. As it is in this ayah: ‘Seest thou not how thy Lord dealt with the Companions of the Elephant?’ (al-Fil 105/1) Meaning don’t you

know? Here what mentioned with ilm is, Allahu alam, seeing which will convince their hearts. As it is in the ayah: 'just to reassure my heart' (al-Baqarah 2/260) This is the statement of Ibrahim (as) when he requested a miracle from his Lord which would fulfill his heart with contentment.

Baghawi says: "Qisai recited as 'hal tastatiu rabbaka' meaning not 'yestatiu' but 'tastatiu'; and not 'rabbuka' but 'rabbaka'. This is the recitation of Ali, Aisha, Ibn Abbas and Mujahid. Meaning 'Are you able to make dua and ask your Lord. Others recited as 'yastatiu rabbuka'. On this occasion there won't be a doubt regarding the qudrah of Allah. It is because it means: 'Would you Lord send down or not?' For example a man would say to his friend: 'Could you lift me?' However he knows that he can lift. So, with this he intended to say: 'would he do this or not'. '...to know that thou hast indeed told us the truth' (al-Maida 5/113) Meaning you are RasulAllah. Meaning so we fulfill with iman and yaqeen. So many recite the ayah as 'Hal yastatiu rabbuka' and others recite as 'hal tastatiu rabbaka' meaning 'Are you able to ask from your Lord?'. (Tafsir)

Ibn Kathir said: "O Isa, son of Maryam! Can your Lord send down to us a Ma'idah from heaven' The Ma'idah is the table that has food on it. Some scholars said that the disciples requested this table because they were poor and deprived. So they asked Isa to supplicate to Allah to send a table of food down to them that they could eat from every day and thus be more able to perform the acts of worship. 'and to know that you have indeed told us the truth' of your Message and our faith in you increases and also our knowledge, 'and that we ourselves be its witnesses' testifying that it is a sign from Allah, as proof and evidence that you are a Prophet, and attesting to the truth of what you brought us" (Tafsir)

Qurtubi explains the ayah: "As-Suddi said: 'The meaning: 'would your Lord comply when you request from Him to send down?' 'Yastatiu' means 'yutiu'. The same as 'istijaba' means 'ijaba'. Therefore 'istataa' means 'ataa'. It is also said: The meaning is: 'Would your Lord estimate it?' Indeed this request took place at the beginning of their submission before they had complete marifah regarding Allah. For this reason Isa (as) said to them as an answer to their mistake and their exceeding the limits which is not permissible regarding Allah: 'Fear Allah, if ye have faith.' (al-Maida 5/112) Meaning 'do not doubt regarding the qudrah of Allah'.

This type of commenting is discussable. It is because disciples are the sincere and helpers of prophets. As it is stated in this ayah: "Be ye helpers of Allah: As said Jesus the son of Mary to the Disciples, 'Who will be my helpers to (the work of) Allah?' Said the disciples, 'We are Allah's helpers!'" (as-Saff 61/14) RasulAllah (saw) said: "Each prophet has a disciple. My disciple is Zubayr." (Bukhari; Muslim; Ibn Majah; Ahmad, Musnad) As it is known, prophets came with marifah regarding Allah, what are necessitated for Him, and what are not permissible (to think) about Him also what are impossible about Him. They notified these to their nations. As it is, how can this matter become hidden to their special people? Until they become ignorant with regards to the qudrah of Allah.

This is also said: Without doubt, this nation was not in doubt regarding the ability of the creator. It is because they were mu'min, arif and alim people. This most likely, looks like your saying to someone: 'can he come?' However you know that he can (come). In this state the meaning is: 'Can He do? Would

he comply to me (my invitation) or not?' Indeed they knew Allah can do this and other things by guidance, message and observation. They intended with this, to know it by certainty.

Likewise Ibrahim (as) said: 'Show me, Lord, how You will raise the dead.' (al-Baqarah 2/260) In fact Ibrahim (as) knew this by the knowledge of the message and knowledge of observation. However he wanted to gain the knowledge of certainty which doubts and suspicion does not involved in it. This is a nice commentary. Nicer than this is, the view which expresses that; this expression belonged to those who were with disciples.

Ibn Hishar stated: The Statement in the ayah of Allah which the disciples told Isa (as) "Can thy Lord send down to us a table set (with viands) from heaven?" (Maide 5/112) does not include a doubt regarding istitaat (able to do). Without doubt this is an expression of kindness of questioning and expression of politeness against Allah. It is because in the ilm of His everything which was possible for the past does not necessarily happen for everyone. Indeed disciples were the best among those who made iman to Isa. As they were like that; how could it be thought that they were ignorant regarding Allah is qadir for everything which is possible. When it comes to recite istitaa with ta 'tastatiu'; it is mentioned that it means: 'Are you able to ask of your Lord?' This is the view of Aisha and Mujahid. Aisha (raa) said: 'This tribe was a tribe who knows very much not to say 'hal yastatiu'. But it was 'hal tastatiu rabbaka.' Likewise it is related that she said: 'Disciples were not in doubt regarding Allah's sending down a table. But they said: 'hal tastatiu rabbaka.' Muad b Jabal (ra) also said: 'RasulAllah (saw) recited us as 'hal tastatiu rabbaka.' I had heard RasulAllah (saw) recited it with 'ta' as 'hal tastatiu rabbaka' for many times.' (Bukhari)

Tabari (ra) said: "A group among the sahabah and tabi'een recited this with 'ta' and the word 'rabb' in mansub form. In this state the meaning is: 'Are you able to ask your Lord?' or 'Will you make dua to your Lord?' or 'Would you find proper to request from Him and able to do so?' Also it is said that: Disciples were not in doubt regarding Allah capability to send it down to them. They told this merely to Isa (as) for himself. 'Can you do this...' Then Tabari starts talking about the form of 'yastatiu' and its being preferable. Without doubt, Allah saw karih (disliked) and not devoutness what they uttered. Allah commanded them to make tawbah moreover renew their iman because of what they uttered, state that Allah is all-power and confirm His rasul regarding the matters which he informs them about Allah. Isa (as) stated the following to show how coarse their statement was when they told him this: "Said Jesus: 'Fear Allah, if ye have faith'." (Maide5/112) Now Allah's calling them to make tawbah to Him due to the statements they uttered and His prophets giving importance to their statements is sufficient evidence that this ayah should be recited with 'ya' as 'yastatiu' and the term 'rabb' as fail with otra as 'rabbuka'. When it comes to the statement of 'Said Jesus: 'Fear Allah, if ye have faith'.' (Maide 5/112) without doubt it means: Meaning Isa (as) told his disciples who told him: 'Can thy Lord send down to us a table set (with viands) from heaven?': O nation! Beware of Allah and forbear from a punishment would come to you from Allah due to your statement. Without doubt, nothing which He wishes would leave Him helpless. Your doubting about Allah is qadir to send down a table from heaven is equal to deny Him. Therefore if you are among the mu'min, then beware of His sending down a punishment for you."

Razi stated: "When it comes to the second way of recitation there occurs such problem. Allah (swt) narrated that the disciples said: 'We have faith, and do thou bear witness that we bow to Allah as Muslims' (al-Maida 5/111) However after they actualized their iman how could it be permissible to say that they were people who doubted regarding Allah having power to do it? We can give answers to this in a few different points:

1- Allah did not attribute them as 'actualizing iman and being Muslim' on the contrary He narrated their claim of these two 'iman and islam' then added the following while narrating from them 'Can thy Lord send down to us a table set (with viands) from heaven?' This shows that they fall into a doubt and hesitated in this issue. It is because such statement would not occur from a person whose iman is perfect... Also they said: 'and to know that thou hast indeed told us the truth' which indicates a sickness in their heart. Statement of Isa (as) towards them: 'Fear Allah, if ye have faith' also indicates that they were not perfect in regards to iman.

2- They were mu'min however they requested this miracle to satisfy their hearts. This is the same as the statement of Ibrahim (as): 'but just to reassure my heart' (al-Baqarah 2/260) Seeing and witnessing such miracles without doubt made satisfaction in the hearts. For this reason the disciples said: 'and satisfy our hearts'.

3- Intention with this statement is to ask whether it is permissible or not with regards to hikmah. This is like that, because when the actions of Allah relied upon seeking the various hikmah; in the time where one of these hikmah does not occur then action will be impossible. It is because something which is wrong according to hikmah will also be wrong according to qudrah. This is an answer according to the view of Mutazilah. However according to our view; this is ascribed to the meaning: 'Would Allah assume this? Would He know that it will occur? It is because if He does not assume and would not know its occurring; this thing will be out of qudrah of Allah and it will be unfeasible and impossible. It is because something which is not known also will not be estimated.'

4- Suddi said that this statement means 'If you request this from Him, will your Lord comply to your request?' This is relied upon that this verb used with the meaning of 'compliance' and the letter sin is accepted zaid.

5- 'Your Lord' which is used in the ayah might refer to Jibril. It is because Jibril also took care of Isa (as) and helped him alot. For this reason Allah (swt) commanded at the beginning of Maida 110: 'I strengthened thee with the holy spirit' Meaning; you claim that Jibril took care of you and helped you. Therefore Can thy Lord (Jibril) send down to us a table set (with viands) from heaven?'

Their intention with this request did not occur because they doubted. On the contrary their intention with this, to establish that sending down a table of Allah is very clear and visible. This is the same as someone holding the hand of a needy, poor person and says: 'Can the governor feed these?'...His intention with this question is to show that it is very clear and visible; it is not permissible for anyone who has intellect to doubt about it." (Tafsir)

Samarqandi narrates the story which was mentioned in this ayah: “When Isa (as) goes anywhere there would be 3 thousand people around him. Some of these were his disciples who made iman onto him, some among them were sick and disabled, and some among them were those who wanted to mock him. Those who made iman onto him did not want to leave him and the sick were present there to be cured with his dua. The other group was present with him to mock him. One day when they were traveling with Isa (as) they reached a cave. Their provisions finished and when they reached the cave no one had anything to eat. They could not find anything to eat after they searched around they applied to the disciples when they became helpless: ‘Ask Isa to make a dua to request from Allah to send down for us a table spread with food from heaven. Therefore Allah sends down a table and we eat from it so we would be saved from hunger.’ Therefore Simon among the disciples of Isa (as) went to Isa and conveyed their request. Isa (as) told Simon: ‘O Simon fear Allah, if ye are true believers. Do not ask a punishment for your own selves.’ And so Simon conveyed the message to them.” (Tafsir Ibn Abbas (ra) also touched upon it: “When the disciples the chosen among them, Simon the Pure said: ‘O Jesus, son of Mary!’ your people are asking: ‘Is thy Lord able’ would your Lord; and it is also said that this means: could you pray to your Lord ‘to send down for us a table spread with food from heaven? He said:’ Jesus said to Simon: tell them ‘Observe your duty to Allah’ fear Allah, ‘if ye are true believers’ if you have firm faith, for it may happen that you would not give gratitude for it and, as a result, be punished. And so Simon conveyed the message to them.” (Tanwir al-Miqbas min tafsir Ibn Abbas)

After all these explanations from the scholars regarding the ayah, is there any doubt left which might be used as evidence for ignorance being excuse in asluddeen?

6- A Doubt about Dhun-Nun Yunus bin Matta

“and imagined that We shall not punish him!” (Anbiya 21/87)

Taking the statement which is related with the departure of Yunus (as) from the city where he had been sent as a messenger; the verb ‘lan naqdira’ in the ayah ‘fa zanne an lan naqdira alayh’ (Anbiya 21/87) as ‘We shall not be able to...’ will cause it to be understood that ‘Yunus deemed that We shall not be able to punish him’. However such understanding carries the attribute of kufr and it is not possible for Yunus (as) to have such understanding as a prophet. But with taking the other usage and meanings of the verb ‘naqdira’ which is derived from ‘qadara’ in Arabic, this confusion will be eliminated easily. It is because the verb ‘qadara’ also means ‘to rule over and to cause/make distress’ other than ‘able to do’. Therefore it is preferred by the mufasssirun that ‘lan naqdira’ should be understood as ‘we will not rule over’ or ‘we will not make/cause distress’. (Tabari; Zamahkshari; Razi; Qurtubi)

According to this; this ayah means: “Dhun-Nun imagined that We shall not distress him!” And this might be relied upon his trust in the mercy of Allah. According to a narration, Muawiya (ra) understood the verb ‘lan naqdira’ as ‘not able to do’ and this caused a huge problem for him. Ibn Abbas (ra) solved the problem while explaining; it means ‘not to distress’ and not ‘not able to’. (Zamahkshari; Razi; Suyuti)

When the verb 'qadara' is understood with regards to the meaning of 'rule over to' Razi stated that this ayah may express the following meaning: "Dhun-Nun imagined that we shall not strongly rule over him." (Razi)

"...thinking that We had no power over him, that is, that We could (not) compel him to (submit to) Our decree in the way that We did by imprisoning him inside the stomach of the whale; or that We could (not) make circumstances difficult for him." (Tafsir al-Jalalayn)

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) said that the statement of the disciples means the same as the statement of Yunus (as): "From this 'Can thy Lord send down to us a table set (with viands) from heaven?' should be understood that 'Did your Lord estimate it in this way?' Likewise the statement of Yunus (as) is also the same: 'He imagined that We had no power over him!' (al-Anbiya 21/87) Meaning he did not realize that We estimated it. As it is said to a person 'would you estimate to do this? Meaning: can you make it. This is a much known usage in the tongues of people." (Fatawa, 8/374)

Ibn Kathir said: "and imagined that We shall not punish him! meaning, constrict him in the belly of the fish. Something similar to this was reported from Ibn Abbas, Mujahid, Ad-Dahhak and others. This was the view favored by Ibn Jarir, and he quoted as evidence for that the Ayah: 'and the man whose resources are restricted, let him spend according to what Allah has given him. Allah puts no burden on any person beyond what He has given him. Allah will grant after hardship, ease' (65/7)." (Tafsir)

In his tafsir Qurtubi said: "It is said that the statement of Yunus (as) 'and imagined that We shall not punish him!...' means: Iblis fooled him and therefore he deemed that Allah may not be able to punish him. However this is a view which is rejected and not accepted. It is because such deem is kufr... According to a narration which is narrated by as-Salabi: According to Ata, Sa'ed b Jubayr and many other scholars it means: He deemed that We will not distress him. Al-Hasan said: This is of the sort of the statements of Allah: 'Allah doth enlarge, or grant by (strict) measure, the sustenance (which He giveth) to whomso He pleaseth.' (ar-Rad 13/26) and also 'and the man whose resources are restricted' (at-Talaq 65/7)." (Tafsir)

With this explanation he is referring that the verbs which were used in all three ayah are the same and were used with the meaning 'distress, grant, restrict'.

Qurtubi continues and says: "I say: It is most probable that this is the view of Sa'ed and al-Hasan. Therefore it has the same meaning and it is 'restrict, distress' and according to al-Mawardi and al-Mahdawi this is also the opinion of Ibn Abbas (ra). According to another explanation; this has the meaning of 'legislation and to rule over' which is derived from 'qadara'. Meaning, he deemed that we may not legislate to punish him, we may not rule over his situation. This explanation was given by Qatada, Mujahid and al-Farra. This is taken from the verb 'qadara' which means 'to rule over' and which is different than 'qadara' which means 'qudrah' and 'istitaat' (able to). According to a narration Abu'l-Abbas Ahmad b Yahya said, which is narrated from Salab, regarding the statement of Allah (awj): "and imagined that We shall not punish him!" being 'muqtadir' (able to) in the statement is derived from

'taqdir' and not from 'kudrah'... Umar b Abdulaziz and Zuhri recited the statement as nun with ota and dal with shadda as a verb which is derived from 'taqdir' with the meaning: 'We may not legislate it'. Al-Mawardi narrated the same recitation from Ibn Abbas. Ubayd, Umayr, Qatada and al-Araj recited it as 'ya' with ota and shadda as in machul form. It means 'he imagined that he shall not be estimated'. Yaqub, Abdullah b Abi Ishaq, al-Hasan and again Ibn Abbas: recited it as the letter 'ya' with ota and 'dal' with fatha and without shadda in machul form which means: 'he may not be afforded.' Again al-Hasan recited it with the meaning: 'may not afford him'. Others recited it as the letter 'nun' with fatha and 'dal' with kasra 'we can not afford him' which are all coming from the meaning of 'taqdir'. I say the scholars explained it in the same way while explaining the hadith of the man who never did any good deed, said that if he died, his family should burn him: 'By Allah, if my Lord takes hold of me...' (Bukhari; Muslim; Nasai; Ibn Majah; Muvatta; Musnad)

According to the first explanation method this hadith means: 'By Allah if Allah, distress me, if He holds it tight regarding taking to accounting, punishing for the sins of course it will (meaning He will punish me as He never punished anyone before)... According to the second method of explanation it means: If Allah (swt) with His qadha and qadar legislates to punish every sinner due to his own sin, without doubt Allah (awj) will punish me due to my sins, as He never punish anyone else.

Scholars of hadith narrated this hadith in Muawatta and some other books. The person who uttered this words was mu'min and muwahhid. Likewise some of the narrations of the hadith it is said that: "he never did any good deed other than tawhid". When Allah (swt) asked him: Why did you do that? He said: "O Lord it is because I was afraid of you" Hasyah (awe) is only present on a mu'min slave who confirms. As Allah (swt) commands: "Those truly fear Allah, among His Servants, who have knowledge." (Fatir, 35/28) It is also said that the statement of 'he thought that We will never distress him' carries the meaning of question. The meaning of the statement is 'did he think that we will never distress him? And here the preposition hamza is eliminated due to concision. This is the view of Sulayman Abu'l-Mutamir. According to the narrations of Qadi Mundhir b Sa'ed some recited this statement with hamza (as a question)." (Tafsir)

Razi said: "The one deems that Allah is not all-capable is kafir. There is no ikhtilaf that attributing this to any mu'min is not permissible. So how could it be attributed to a prophet? Therefore here making explanations is a must. Explanations regarding this matter are:

1- His statement in the ayah means: 'he imagined that We can not distress, coress him.' This is the same as Allah referring to 'qadara' as 'restrict' in the ayah Ankabut 29/62, at-Talaq 65/7 and Fajr 85/16. According to this the meaning of the statement is: 'we can not distress, restrict him'...Yunus (as) thought that he is free to choose, if he wanted he would stay there if he wanted he would leave; Allah (awj) would not restrict him regarding his selection.

2- This statement is sort of a comparison. According to this it means: 'His situation looks like the one who thought that Allah would not distress him after he left the city without waiting for the command of Allah'.

3- The term 'qudrah' in the ayah is explained as 'qadha, hukm'. According to this the meaning is: "He deemed that We would not over rule him with strict rulings..." This is the view of Mujahid, Qatada, Dahhak and Kalbi and it is the view which is narrated from Ibn Abbas by Awfi. This view is at the same time the view of Farra and Zajaj. Zajaj said: The word 'naqdira' means 'muqaddira'. Likewise in Arabic it is said: "Allah estimated it with the best manner." So qadara and qaddara can be used in the same meaning. According to this the word 'qadara' in the ayah means 'estimated'. Likewise Umar ibn Abdulaziz and Zuhri recited this words as 'lan nuqaddira' nun with damma dal with shadda and with tafil bab; Ubayd ibn Umar recited it as machul and with shadda 'lan yuqaddara'; Yaqub recited it as 'lan yuqdara' without shadda and machul. It is reported that Ibn Abbas (ra) went to Muawiya (ra). Muawiya asked him: "Last night the waves of the Qur'an hit me...And I drown in the waves; I find only salvation for my own to ask to you." When Ibn Abbas (ra) asked: "What is the matter?" Muawiya (ra) said: "Nabi of Allah thought that Allah would not capable of him." Ibn Abbas (ra) said: "This statement in the ayah is not derived from the verb 'qudrah' but 'qadara'.

4- This statement means 'He deemed that We cant do anything..' It is because there is a relation between qudrah and the verb. Consequently it is not a far possibility to use one in the place of another and use a metaphor.

5- This is a question which has the meaning of condemning: "Does he imagine that We shall not punish him?" This is narrated from Ibn Zayd.

6- According to those who say that this event happened before Yunus (as) was appointed as a prophet, such presumption took place before prophethood. It is not a far possibility that those who are not a prophet and nabi with the delusion of the shaitan such suspicion could occur and later they reject this with hujjah (evidence) and burhan (proof). (Tafsir)

g- Heresy can only be a matter of question after bayan

Doubt: By using the ayah "And Allah will not mislead a people after He hath guided them, in order that He may make clear to them what to fear (and avoid)." (at-Tawba 9/115) some have said: Heresy can only be a matter of question after bayan. This ayah is also comprises matters of shirk etc.

Likewise the heresy (deviation) mentioned in the ayah had occurred after the situation of bayan.

Following is what the ahl sunnah understood from the ayah:

When the ahl sunnah wanted to extract a certain hukm they would apply the evidence altogether not separately, also they would apply the evidence from the Qur'an as one part testifying the other; not the opposite.

It is stated in the ayah as follows: "Allah has revealed (from time to time) the most beautiful Message in the form of a Book, consistent with itself, (yet) repeating (its teaching in various

aspects)." (az-Zumar 39/23)

Meaning one part resembles the other and does not contain any ikhtilaf. The same situation is explained in the following ayah: "Do they not consider the Qur'an (with care)? Had it been from other than Allah, they would surely have found therein Much discrepancy.." (an-Nisa 4/82)

Fundamentally when all evidences regarding any matter are gathered in one place and each one is relied upon the area it concerns with a totalitarian logic only then a hukm is established and openly becomes clear. The ahl-i bid'ah (wa iyadu billah) looks with a mutashabih view mixes up the evidences by embracing single evidences liberated from others and by doing this wrestles the evidence with one another and demolishes shairah.

Now in this ayah even though the Qur'an invalidates the attribute of heresy prior to bayan this is only regarding the matters other than shirk and kufr. In reality the Qur'an in many ayah establishes that the attribute of heresy is possible prior to bayan:

"It is He Who has sent amongst the Unlettered a messenger from among themselves, to rehearse to them His Signs, to sanctify them, and to instruct them in Scripture and Wisdom,- although they had been, before, in manifest error." (Jumua 62/2)

"Celebrate His praises as He has directed you, even though, before this, ye went astray." (al-Baqarah 2/198)

Qurtubi says: "Meaning 'prior to the revelation of the Qur'an you had been only deviated ones in heresy'."

Also there is the Prophets (saw) hadith: "Did I not see you in heresy? Which, Allah gave you guidance with me. Likewise you had been hungry and Allah made you rich with me." (Nawawi Sharh, 7/157)

This hadith had been stated when some among the ansar had complained about his (saw) distribution of the booty.

These nass from the Qur'an and sunnah, show that the mushrik had been deviator prior to risalah meaning bayan. This following ayah also carries the same meaning: "Some He hath guided: Others have (by their choice) deserved the loss of their way; in that they took the evil ones, in preference to Allah, for their friends and protectors, and think that they receive guidance." (al-Araf 7/30)

Ibni Kathir related that Ibn Jarir said, "This is one of the clearest arguments proving the mistake of those who claim that Allah does not punish anyone for disobedient acts he commits of deviations he believes it until after knowledge of what is correct reaches him, then he were to obstinately avoid it anyway. If this were true, then there would be no difference between the deviations of the misguided group - their belief that they are guided - and the group that is in fact guided. Yet Allah has differentiated between the two in this noble Ayah, doing so in both name and judgement." (Tafsir)

Baghawi stated: "It means that in this ayah there is evidence that the kafir who believes to be on haq and the denier and stubborn are equivalent."

The two imams of the ahl sunnah Ibn Jarir at-Tabari and Ibn Kathir likewise Imam Baghawi state that in these two mentioned ayah it is indicated that those who believe to be upon haq and sirat-i mustaqim however due to ignorance and ta'weel is a kafir upon a deviated path among deviated paths will definitely not be excused. This way it has been understood that this ayah establishes that the kafir and mushrik are exceptions from their hukm and are not included in what they comprise.

"And Allah will not mislead a people after He hath guided them, in order that He may make clear to them what to fear (and avoid)- for Allah hath knowledge of all things." (at-Tawba 9/115)

Likewise Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "When the word 'Heresy' is used in certainty it expresses the one who has deviated from hidayah. Whether it is done knowingly or out of ignorance. This necessitates the individual to see punishment as in these ayahs: 'So they (too) were rushed down on their footsteps!' (Saffat 37/70) 'And they would say: 'Our Lord! We obeyed our chiefs and our great ones, and they misled us as to the (right) Path. Our Lord! Give them double Penalty and curse them with a very great Curse!'. ' (Ahzab 33/67-68) '...there comes to you Guidance from Me, whosoever follows My Guidance, will not lose his way, nor fall into misery.' (Ta-ha 20/123)" (Fatawa, 7/166)

1- The heresy prior to bayan (hukm) and the attribute of heresy being stable

The following ayahs also have the same meaning:

"...who doth more wrong than one who invents a lie against Allah, to lead astray men without knowledge? For Allah guideth not people who do wrong." (al-Anam 6/144)

"Lost are those who slay their children, from folly, without knowledge, and forbid food which Allah hath provided for them, inventing (lies) against Allah. They have indeed gone astray and heeded no guidance." (al-Anam 6/140)

Ibni Kathir said: "As for this life, they lost when they killed their children and made it difficult for themselves by prohibiting some types of their wealth, as an act of innovation that they invented on their own. As for the Hereafter, they will end up in the worst dwellings, because they used to lie about Allah and invent falsehood about Him. Allah also said, Al-Hafiz Abu Bakr bin Marduwiyah recorded that Ibn Abbas commented, "If it pleases you to know how ignorant the Arabs used to be, then recite the Ayat beyond Ayah one hundred and thirty in Surat Al-An'am, Indeed lost are they who have killed their children, foolishly, without knowledge, and [they] have forbidden that which Allah has provided for them, inventing a lie against Allah. They have indeed gone astray and were not guided.)" Al-Bukhari also recorded this in the section of his Sahih on the virtues of the Quraysh." (Tafsir)

This ayah that mentions the Quraysh prior to risalah states that they had been upon heresy prior to a bayan sent from Allah regardless of their ignorance and slander. It is because this is included in tashri and is considered the most dangerous type of shirk. Moreover although Allah it is the base of all types of tashri shirk done other than Him. It is because if the slaves keep stable within the sharee'ah of Allah and if they do not exceed its borders, neither shirk nor bid'ah will be seen.

This ayah also carries the same meaning: "Let them bear, on the Day of Judgment, their own burdens in full, and also (something) of the burdens of those without knowledge, whom they misled. Alas, how grievous the burdens they will bear!." (Nahl 16/25)

2- The Base of heresy is ignorance

Qurtubi stated Mujahid had said regarding this ayah "Let them bear, on the Day of Judgment, their own burdens in full, and also (something) of the burdens of those without knowledge, whom they misled." (an-Nahl 16/25) They shoulder the sins of those they deviated. When it is as such from the sins of those deviated nothing will decrease. It has been narrated: "To the individual who calls to deviation there is the same sin as those who submit to him. Wherever there is someone who calls to hidayah there is the same ajr as those who submit to him. Likewise none of their ajr will decrease."

There is a narration by Muslim regarding this. Here the 'min' preposition mentioned in the Arabic statement does not signify a certain situation but it signifies a general situation. (Muslim)

According to this there is the similar sin to the callers of heresy as those who follow them. Ignorantly they deviate the society due to their (the society) ignorance with things that will gain them sin. It is because if they had known they would not have fallen into deviation."

The same view is found in the tafsir of Ibn Jarir and Ibn Kathir. These evidences establish the sin of the individual who has ignorantly deviated while in shirk and bid'ah in his itikad.

This ayah is in complete ittifaq with the following hadith narrated from Bukhari who begins with the title "Holding Fast to the Qur'an and Sunnah..." and continues by saying: Because in the ayah it has been stated: "Wa la takfu -And pursue not- that of which thou hast no knowledge." (Isra 17/36)

Surely after Allah has given you ilm he will not lift it by taking it back. However He will take away their scholars along with their ilm and people will remain ignorant. They will ask for fatawa. Those who are asked will answer according to their wills and by this will deviate and cause deviation. In the narration from Harmala it is as follows: "...people will take as their leaders ignorant persons who when consulted will give their verdict without knowledge. So they will go astray and will lead the people astray..." (Bukhari; Muslim)

Hafidh stated: "In the hadith of Abu Umamah there are also these statements: Surely books remaining after the death of the ulamaa and the lift of ilm will not benefit without a scholar. In the continuation of the hadith it is stated: An Arab asked him: "O RasulAllah how could ilm be taken from us when we have the books... while we are learning from them and teaching them to

our children, wives and servants?" Angrily he (saw) lifted his head and said: Here the Jewish and Nasara. There are books among them yet they do not own anything from that which their prophet has brought them. (sunnan Ibn Majah, Bab'u Zihab al Qur'an w'al ilm, 2/377) This extra versions are witnessed in the hadith of A'waf ibn Malik ibn A'mr, Safwan ibn I'sal etc. Also similar versions of this hadith can be found in Tirmidhi, Tabarani, Darimi and Bazzar." (Fathul Bari 13/295-299)

This hadith clearly states the validity of the attribute of heresy over the individual who follows and is followed (tabi and matbu) regardless of the apparent ignorance. Both the ayah and hadith show that in the environment of ignorance and ta'weel the attributes of heresy and sin are clearly valid. This is only mentionable in situations of shirk and bid'ah. For this reason in the same source (al-Itisam bil Kitab wa sunnah) Bukhari had opened a bab and named it 'the sin of the caller of heresy or the bab of the one who sets a bad example'. It is stated in the ayah "Let them bear, on the Day of Judgment, their own burdens in full, and also (something) of the burdens of those without knowledge, whom they misled." (an-Nahl 16/25)" (Bukhari)

Hafidh stated: "When it comes to the hadith whoever calls to heresy Muslim, Abu Dawud and Tirmidhi had related these. Narrated by Abu Hurayrah RasulAllah (saw) said: 'He who called to righteousness, there would be reward for him like the rewards of those who adhered to it, without their rewards being diminished in any respect. And he who called to error, he shall have to carry of its sin, like those who committed it, without their sins being diminished in any respect.' (Muslim, Tirmidhi, Abu Dawud, Muwatta) Muhallab stated this and the bab prior to this means keeping distant from heresy, keeping distant from bid'ah and fabricated things in deen and restricting from opposing the path of the muminun. The explanation of keeping distant in the hadith is like this: as the individual who invented the bid'ah did not care much about it due to the lightness of the situation he will not be aware of the fasad which will be incumbent on it. This is the matter of the sin of the individual who preforms the act after him which will also reach him (the sin). Even if he has not acted upon it (preformed the amal) himself. The reason is because it will be the same due to being active in personally inventing and because he was the first." (Fathul Bari, 13/315)

It is understood from evidence from the Qur'an and sahih hadith that surely heresy and sin, is just as valid in ignorance in shirk, bid'ah and innovated things also in situations of imitation. This alots the generality of the following ayah: "And Allah will not mislead a people after He hath guided them, in order that He may make clear to them what to fear (and avoid)." (at-Tawba 9/115)

Ibn Kathir quotes from Ibn Jarir commented the ayah: "Allah says that He would not direct you to misguidance, so that you invoke Him for forgiveness for your dead idolators, after He gave you guidance and directed you to believe in Him and in His Messenger! First, He will inform you of what you should avoid, so that you avoid it. Before He informs you that this action is not allowed, you would not have disobeyed Him and fallen into what He prohibited for you [if you indulge in this action]. Therefore, in this case, He will not allow you to be misguided. Verily, guidance or misguidance occurs after commands and prohibitions are established. As for those who were neither commanded nor prohibited, they can neither be obedient nor disobedient in doing what they were neither ordered nor prohibited from doing." (Tafsir)

The explanation of Ibn Kathir and Ibn Jarir regarding the following ayah should be taken notice. "Some He hath guided: Others have (by their choice) deserved the loss of their way; in that they took the evil ones, in preference to Allah, for their friends and protectors, and think that they receive guidance." (al-Araf 7/30)

The ayah is very clear regarding the fact that the individual will be held responsible in itikad however in commands and restrictions will not be called to account. This following ayah "And Allah will not mislead a people after He hath guided them, in order that He may make clear to them what to fear (and avoid)" (at-Tawba 9/115) is proof that the previous ayah does not comprise the matter of the later ayah. Due to this difference of subjects within these two ayahs there is no contradiction either.

3- Punishment can only be mentioned after bayan

Imam Baghawī stated: "And Allah will not mislead a people after He hath guided them, in order that He may make clear to them what to fear (and avoid)." (at-Tawba 9/115) Meaning Allah will not rule you with heresy due to you abandoning the commandments regarding the restriction of istighfar to the mushrik.

Ibn Kathir Allah will not mislead a people after He hath guided them, in order that He may make clear to them what to fear (and avoid) Meaning Allah describes His Honorable Self and just judgment in that He does not lead a people astray but after the Message comes to them, so that the proof is established against them. For instance, Allah said, Mujahid commented on Allah's saying And Allah will never lead a people astray after He has guided them Allah the Mighty and Sublime is clarifying to the believers about not seeking forgiveness for the idolators in particular, and in general, it is an exhortation to beware of disobeying Him, and encouragement to obey Him. So either do or suffer." (Tafsir)

Dahhak said: Allah is not to punish any tribe prior to informing them what they must keep distant from with the risalah that came to them.

These are the statements of the mufasssir regarding this ayah. According to this, this ayah had been revealed when the muslimeen had taken Ibrahim (as)'s request for his father to be forgiven as an example and began to request forgiveness for their mushrik deceased ancestors. This is masiyah (disobedience). However there had not been a mention of such restriction prior to this. When it is as such after the revelation of the restriction the muslimeen feared its sin. Upon this the following ayah had been revealed: "And Allah will not mislead a people after He hath guided them, in order that He may make clear to them what to fear (and avoid)." (at-Tawba 9/115)

The ulama stated: Surely this is valid for all commands and restrictions other than shirk and bid'ah. Likewise with the permit of Allah all nass and evidences of sharee'ah make ittifaq at this point.

4- The heresy which necessitates punishment is only possible after risalah

The heresy restricted in the ayah is a heresy which necessitates punishment. Likewise this is what Dahhak stated. This punishment is in a state of being lifted until all hukm of sharee'ah regarding usul and furu, major and minor reach. The reason is because it is stated in the ayah "nor would We visit with Our Wrath until We had sent an messenger (to give warning). " (al-Isra 17/15)

According to this there is no warning to abstain or command which is not connected to evidence from the sharee'ah. Likewise the proposal to the slave is only mentionable after the notice along with lifting of all the obstacles. Such heresy is a situation which necessitates punishment in both dunya and in akhirah.

When it comes to the heresy such as the loss of the path of righteousness; this becomes a reality even prior to risalah. It is because one can only be saved from heresy with evidence from Allah. Likewise in a sahih hadith RasulAllah (saw) stated: "My servants, all of you are liable to err except one whom I guide on the right path, so seek right guidance from Me so that I should direct you to the right path." (Muslim; Ibn Majah; Tirmidhi)

This means in reality without evidence and explanation from Allah heresy can not be exited. For this reason whoever falls in to shirk prior to risalah he is a mushrik and deviated. Even if bayan had not come to him from Allah. The reason is he had violated his oath, agreement, fitrah and the kawni ayah. For this reason the Qur'an has attributed the mushrik prior to risalah with heresy. As in the following ayahs:

"although they had been, before, in manifest error." (al-Jumua 62/2)

"Celebrate His praises as He has directed you, even though, before this, ye went astray." (al-Baqarah 2/198)

As in this hadith: "Did I not see you in heresy? Which, Allah gave you guidance with me." (Muslim)

Shirk prior to risalah is also evil and deviation as it is being distant from the path of righteousness. Therefore it is reason for punishment. However this relies on a condition which is the condition of the nawawi risalah. For this reason as Ibn Taymiyyah stated the attribute of mushrik is stable even prior to risalah because the individual performs shirk to his Rabb. Ibn Qayyim stated: Surely the hujjah regarding shirk is 'aql. When it comes to the nabawi hujjah this is hujjah that is a necessity for punishment.

From this it is understood that the heresy prior to bayan is exiting the sirat mustaqeem. The doers of this are definitely not Muslim if they had performed shirk. However they will not be punished in both dunya and in akhirah. This is according to the chosen view. However the situation after nabawi hujjah and explanation is different. Fundamentally this ayah should be understood like this: "We sent not a messenger except (to teach) in the language of his (own) people, in order to make (things) clear to them. Now Allah leaves straying those whom He pleases and guides whom He pleases: and He is Exalted in power, full of Wisdom." (Ibrahim 14/4)

The deviation mentioned here is the heresy possible after risalah. This heresy is a deviation which necessitates punishment in both dunya and akhirah (darayn) after hujjah had been established. The tribes had already been in open heresy prior to this hujjah because the prophets are sent to the mushrik tribes. They (prophets) will call them (the mushrik tribes) to sahih fitrah, Islam and ibadah which they

had been created for. Those tribes had been upon open heresy and on a path different and distant from sirat-i mustaqeem before the prophets came. For this reason they had not been the ones who found hidayah. Allah commands: "Allah leaves straying those whom He pleases and guides whom He pleases." (Ibrahim 14/4) The reason is because they had not been upon hidayah and sirati mustaqeem prior to risalah. For this reason as mentioned before the Qur'an had stabilised heresy prior to bayan and risalah. Fundamentally there are many ayah which are evidence for this.

Likewise in this ayah: "Thus doth Allah make clear to you (His law), lest ye err." (an-Nisa 4/176) Meaning so they do not deviate and with the worry they will make others deviate.

Now there is no doubt prior to risalah the mushrik had been in heresy and deviated. However after nabawi hujjah if they are to continue and insist on their shirk and filth in this case they will deserve punishment in both dunya and in akhirah. Allah commands: "A Book which We have revealed unto thee, in order that thou mightest lead mankind out of the depths of darkness into light - by the leave of their Lord - to the Way of (Him) the Exalted in power, worthy of all praise!- " (Ibrahim 14/1)

Imam Shawkani states regarding the ayah "Lead mankind out of the depths of darkness into light." (Ibrahim 14/1) Meaning to pull you out to the nur of 'ilm, iman and hidayah from the darkness of kufr, ignorance and heresy.

From this frame according to the evidence from the Qur'an prior to nabawi hujjah and bayan people had been in the darkness of kufr, shirk and heresy. However this heresy only necessitates punishment after the nabawi hujjah.

Again regarding the following ayah Shawkani states: "We sent not a messenger except (to teach) in the language of his (own) people, in order to make (things) clear to them. Now Allah leaves straying those whom He pleases and guides whom He pleases: and He is Exalted in power, full of Wisdom." (Ibrahim 14/4) Heresy came prior to hidayah because it already existed prior to risalah. Meaning it continues upon asl. Hidayah later builds that which is not present.

This means heresy had been stable prior to risalah and existed prior to hidayah. For this reason it tries to stand upon asl and hidayah tries to build that which doesn't exist. Regarding this matter we could establish the following:

1- Surely shirk was clear heresy prior to risalah and nabawi hujjah. The doer is a mushrik and not a Muslim. If the doer is to insist upon this shirk after hujjah he will deserve punishment. The Ahl sunnah had determined this.

2- After the arrival of the hukm of sharee'ah after the commands and restrictions heresy can occur.

3- Even in the tribes' imitation in bid'ah and innovations as they will be sinners heresy and sin is valid for them.

The situation after the risalah reaches is described in this ayah: “And Allah will not mislead a people after He hath guided them, in order that He may make clear to them what to fear (and avoid).” (at-Tawba 9/115)

According to this the ayah is general other than shirk and bid'ah. In this sense this ayah and the following hadith are the same: “Let them bear, on the Day of Judgment, their own burdens in full, and also (something) of the burdens of those without knowledge, whom they misled. Alas, how grievous the burdens they will bear!.” (Nahl 16/25) “And he who called to error, he shall have to carry of its sin, like those who committed it, without their sins being diminished in any respect.” (Muslim)

This situation is general in akaid including to turn away from and to submit to that other than Allah, His Rasul and the path of the muminun. The evidence establishes this and there is no ikhtilaf among them.

Dominance and gratitude belongs to Allah. With this inshaAllah the invalidity of wrongful conclusions extracted from the Qur'an has been rid.

(ii) Wrongful conclusions extracted from the Hadith

a-The matter of Shirku'l-Khafie (Hidden shirk)

Ahmad and Tabari, narrated from Abu Musa al Ashari (r.a) that he said: "One day RasulAllah delivered a sermon saying 'O people fear Shirk for it is more hidden/ inconspicuous than the creeping of an ant.' Those whom Allah wished asked, 'And how do we avoid it when it is more hidden than the creeping of an ant, O RasulAllah?' He (saw) replied, 'Say: Allaahumma Innaa na'oodhu bika an nushrika bika shay'an na'lamuh, wa nastaghfiruka limaa laa na'lamuh (O Allah, we seek refuge in you from knowingly committing shirk with you and we ask your forgiveness for what we do not know about).'" (Ahmad; Tabari; Sahih al Targheeb wat-Tarheeb)

Abu Bakr related that RasulAllah (saw) said: “Shirk amongst you is more hidden than the crawling of an ant, and I shall tell you of something which, if you do it, will remove from you both the minor and the major Shirk. Say: Allahumma innee a'oothu bika an ushrika bika wa ana a'lamu wa astagh-firuka limma laa a'lam (O Allah, surely I seek refuge in you from knowingly worshipping others besides you and I seek your forgiveness for what I don't know).” (Sahih al-Jaami)

By taking this and similar hadith the claimant of the doubt said:

“See here RasulAllah informs us there are 2 types of shirk the first is the type we know and the second is that which we do not know and that is hidden. RasulAllah commanded that when an unknown and hidden shirk is preformed by us to ask Allah for forgiveness in order that we are not responsible from it. RasulAllah would only command us to seek forgiveness regarding the matters which Allah may forgive us. This shows that the shirk which is not known by the slave is not the shirk which Allah informs of not

forgiving in this ayah: "Allah forgiveth not that partners should be set up with Him; but He forgiveth anything else, to whom He pleaseth." (an-Nisa 4/48) This shows that if a person performs shirk he does not know of he will not be attributed as mushrik and the ignorant will not be responsible for his ignorance. A shirk an individual has learnt will become a known shirk to him. This is a matter with no ikhtilaf. For this reason if this individual performs this shirk he will be kafir and mushrik and the hukm of murtad will be given to him. The reason is because the shirk he performed is not hidden shirk and he is aware of it."

I say: "For the sake of Allah think! How the scholars of taghout deviate the hadith of RasulAllah (saw) and shape them into something else! In this hadith who said the shirk mentioned was major shirk? Which scholar said "if an individual does not know major shirk and performs it he will not be given the attribute of mushrik because he is ignorant in this matter and he did not know shirk" and brought the previous hadith as evidence?

The meaning of your understanding from this hadith is the following: "As long as the individual does not know that the shirk he performed is major shirk no one will be attributed as mushrik. For this reason it is never permissible to attribute such individual as mushrik"

This understanding is opposing the certain evidences from the book and sunnah. With the help of Allah this had been explained under the heading "Although people had been living in ignorance, the evidence regarding the fact that, their attribute of mushrik had been valid prior to the Hujjah brought by Nabi"

When it comes to shirk mentioned in the hadith, that which we may not know, that which is hidden and when such act is performed by us that which we will not be attributed as mushrik with is certainly not major shirk. This is hidden shirk which does not take one out of the fold of Islam and that is a type of minor shirk.

The evidence for this is the following: Abu Sa`ed (ra) reported that RasulAllah (saw) came to us while we were discussing about Dajjal and said, "Should I not inform you of that which I fear for you even more than the dangers of Dajjal? It is the hidden Shirk; A person stands to pray, and he beautifies his prayer because he sees the people looking at him." (Ahmad; Ibn Majah; al-Bayhaqi; Sahih al-Jaami; Majmua'uz-Zawaid)

Related from Muhammad ibn Labid: RasulAllah came to us and said: "O people beware of hidden shirk! They said "O RasulAllah what is hidden shirk? He said: A person stands to pray, and he beautifies his prayer because he sees the people looking at him. This is hidden shirk." (Ibn Huzayma, Sahih)

Mahmud ibn Labid reported that RasulAllah (saw) said, "The thing that I fear most for you is the minor Shirk; Riya" (Ahmad, Musnad; Tabarani)

Shaddad b. Aws (ra) stated: "In the time of RasulAllah we would accept riya as minor shirk." (Ibn Abi Dunya, Ihklas; Ibn Hajar, at-Tahzib; Tabarani and Hakim narrated and said it was sahih)

It is reported in al-Jaami' as-Sagheer hadith #4934 that RasulAllah (saw) said: "Shirk ul-Khafie in the Muslim nation is more inconspicuous than the creeping of a black ant on a black stone in the darkness of the night." And this inconspicuous Shirk is expiated by saying thrice the following sentences within a day and a night: "Allahumma innee a'oodhu bika an ushrika bika wa-anaa a'alam, wa-astaghfiruka limaa laa a'alam" (O Allah, I take refuge in you lest I should commit shirk with you knowingly, and I seek your forgiveness for what I do unknowingly.)

Hudhayfah (ra) narrated from Abu Bakr (ra) and he from RasulAllah (saw) that RasulAllah said: "Shirk is much hidden than the sound of the footstep of an ant." Abu Bakr said: "O RasulAllah! Does not shirk only consist of ibadah to other than Allah or calling upon another along with Allah? RasulAllah (saw) answered: "O you who may loose your mother! The shirk in you is more hidden than the sound of the footsteps of an ant."

In another narration the following is also added: "It is saying Allah and such and such gave me. To equivalent is a person saying if it wasn't for such and such, so and so would have killed me." (Suyuti, ad-Durrul Mansur)

1- Shirku'l-asghar (minor/lesser shirk)

Shirku'l-asghar or minor/lesser shirk does not expel one from the religion of Islam, but it causes a deficiency in Tawhid; and it is a way to major Shirk. Do not think though that minor shirk is a small issue, as the sin of committing minor shirk is worse than the major sins – you have in order of gravity: major shirk then minor shirk and then comes all the other sins. So minor shirk is worse than committing murder or adultery. The fundamental difference between Shirku'l-Akbar and Shirku'l-Asghar is that the first takes one outside the fold of Islam, whereas the second does not, though it can lead to major shirk.

Saying: 'What Allah wills and what you will' is a type of minor shirk. This statement was made by a man to RasulAllah (saw) who objected to it by saying: "Do you make me a rival along with Allah? Say: What Allah alone wills." (Bukhari, al-Adabul-Mufrad; Ahmad; Nasai, al-Amalul-Yawm wa-Laylah; Ibn Majah)

Wearing an amulet, ring, bead, bracelet, chain or thread to remove an affliction, or illness; or hanging an amulet or wearing a ring, chain or thread in fear of the evil eye or other than it or hanging a horseshoe, rabbits foot or the like to bring good fortune or a charm to prevent misfortune etc. are also type of minor shirk.

It is important to note that if it is believed that these things are causes for the raising of an affliction or illness, and averting misfortune or bringing benefit, then this is minor shirk, because Allah (swt) did not make these to be causes for such things. However if it is believed that these created things protect, remove illness and bring good fortune in and of themselves then this is major shirk, because that is devotion to other than Allah.

Attaining knowledge, or performing Jihaad for the sake of wealth or praise. RasulAllah (saw) said: "May the slave of the Dinaar be degraded and may the slave of the Dirham be degraded" (Bukhari)

It was related by al-Rubayi' bint Mu'awidh that she said her slave girls used to sing saying, "We have a Prophet who knows what tomorrow will bring." RasulAllah (saw) told her to leave that statement, but to carry on chanting." Of course, the belief that RasulAllah (saw) knew the unseen contradicts the Qur'an, which commanded RasulAllah (saw) to say, "I do not know the unseen." (al-Anam 6/50)

On the authority of Ar-Rubai' bint Mu'awwadh, who said: "RasulAllah (saw) entered my house after my wedding night, and sat on my mat as close as you are now sitting to me (the address here is to the one who narrated the hadith from her). Then, some servant girls of ours began beating on the duff and singing about our ancestors who were killed at the battle of Badr. Then one of them said: "And among us is a prophet who knows what tomorrow will bring." RasulAllah (saw) said to her: "Leave this and go back to what you were saying before it."

Ibn Hajar stated the following while giving explanation of the hadith: "It is understood from the hadith that, it is permissible to listen to the duff which is played during the morning of the wedding and (it is also understood that) stating anyone among the creatures know the ghayb is makruh." (Fathu'l-Bari, 8/#4001) "Leave this (words)! Meaning stop telling prohibited words which includes extreme on praise. In the narration which is related by Hammad ibn Salama there is the addition of: 'None other than Allah would know what will happen tomorrow'. With this he (saw) referred the reason of prohibition. In the statement: 'go back to what you were saying before it' there is indication that it is permissible listening praise and elegy which does not contain extremism and exaggeration in it." (Fathu'l-Bari, 10/#5147)

The reason it is shirk to take oath by other than Allah is: People take oath over things which are most worthy for them and things that they love the most. This certainly is only Allah (swt) therefore taking oath can only be over the name of Allah. However if it is asked to those who take oath by other than Allah (like those sahabah) what is the most worthy thing for you? They would say 'Allah'. When it comes to swearing with the names of taghout and/or idols than it is major shirk. It is because showing respect and love towards the idols is major shirk. The reason behind it is not only taking oath with their names but showing respect towards them. It is because this is revering the idol and revering shirk.

Nasai related from Sa'd bin Abi Waqqas (ra): "We were discussing some issues. I just had turned from the beliefs of the jahiliyyah. I swore over the names of Lat and Uzza. Therefore the ashab of RasulAllah told me: 'What ugly statement you uttered. Go to RasulAllah, and inform him. We only decide that you turned back to kufr. I went to RasulAllah and informed him about the issue. RasulAllah said: 'Utter thrice that there is no god other than Allah Who is alone. Then seek refuge from the shaitan thrice then spit thrice to your left side and do not repeat it.'" (Nasai) As seen sahabah also made takfir of one who swore over the names of idols. And RasulAllah (saw) asked him to utter La-ilaha illallah.

Abu Hurayrah (ra) reported RasulAllah (saw) saying: "He who takes an oath in the course of which he

says: By Lat (and al-'Uzza), he should say: There is no god but Allah; and that if anyone says to his friend: Come and I will gamble with you," he should pay sadaqa." (Abdurrazzak, Musannaf; Muslim; Abu Dawud; Bukhari; Tirmidhi)

Imam San'ani said: "This shows that the individual has left the fold of Islam due to his "khalif" meaning his oath in the name of his idol and has made irtidad (become murtad) and the Rasul (saw) commanded him to renew his Islam." (Tathiru'l-I'tiqad an-Adran al-Ilhad)

Swearing over things which are different than taghout, shirk, or signs of kufr is different than this. Example of this is the following riwayat: Burayda said: "RasulAllah commanded: 'Whoever swore over custody is not from among us.'" (Ahmad)

The swearing by other than Allah (awj) is shirk no matter how elevated the status of the object upon which the oath taken is. RasulAllah (saw) said: "Whoever swears by other than Allah commits disbelief or shirk" (Abu Dawoud; Nawawi, Riyaadu's-Saliheen; Tirmidhi, who degreed as a hasan hadith. It was authenticated by Imam ash-Shawkani (ra) in Naylul-Awtaar 8/257)

It is narrated from Abdullah b. Umar that RasulAllah (saw) found, Umar b. al-Khattab amongst the riders and he was taking oath by his father RasulAllah (saw) called them (saying): "Our Allah (awj) has forbidden you that you take oath by your father. He who bag to take an oath, he must take it by Allah or keep quiet." (Muslim)

Nasai edited and related the following hadith from Qutaylah "A Jew reported to RasulAllah (saw) that some Muslims were guilty of shirk in that they said: 'How wonderful that Allah and you have willed it' and 'By the Ka'bah ...' Therefore, RasulAllah (saw) commanded the people to swear, instead, by the Lord of the Ka'bah, and to say: 'How wonderful that Allah has willed it, and then that you willed it also!'" (Nasai; Ahmad)

It is not possible for the sahabah to be among the mushrik till the day RasulAllah informed them. Moreover it is not possible for RasulAllah not to inform them regarding a matter which is major shirk.

Nasai also reported from Ibn Abbas: "Once, a man said to RasulAllah (saw) 'How wonderful that Allah and you have willed it!' RasulAllah (saw) objected: 'Have you made me an equal associate to Allah? Rather say, How wonderful that Allah alone has willed it!'"

Clearer evidence is the following hadith:

Ibn Majah reported from Tufayl, Aishah's halfbrother on her mother's side, that he said: "I came upon a group of Jews. I said to them: 'You are indeed the people of Allah if only you didn't claim that 'Uzayr is His son.' They answered: 'You are indeed the People of Allah, if only you didn't say "How wonderful that Allah and Muhammad have willed it"! Then I came upon a group of Christians and said to them. 'You are indeed the People of Allah except that you claim that Christ is the son of Allah.' They said: 'You too are

indeed the People of Allah except that you say: 'How wonderful that Allah and Muhammad have willed it!' I related what happened to some of my fellows and then went to RasulAllah. He asked: 'Did you tell anyone else?' I answered, 'Yes.' He praised Allah and thanked Him, and then said: 'Tufayl has already communicated to some of you his judgment or vision. You have been repeating words which I would have rather forbidden you to use much earlier, but did not for such and such reasons. Hence-forth, do not say: 'How wonderful that Allah and Muhammad have willed it,' but 'How wonderful that Allah alone has willed it'!" (Ibn Majah; Darimi; Ahmad)

Muhammad bin Abdulwahab (ra) listed some benefits of the hadith and said:

"1-The Jews' knowledge of lesser shirk.

4- That this is not greater shirk because of the Prophet's declaration that he had reasons for not forbidding it earlier." (Kitabu Tawhid)

RasulAllah stated that he had reasons for not forbidding it earlier. This shows that stating such things are not among the major shirk. If they were major shirk, RasulAllah (saw) would have never delayed and would have informed them right away.

Ibn Majah related, with satisfactory isnad, from ibn Umar, that RasulAllah (saw) said: "Do not swear by your fathers. Swear by Allah alone; and do so, truly."

Muhammad Ibn Abdulwahab (ra) said: "Ibn Hatim related that in regard to this verse (al-Baqarah 2/22), Ibn Abbas said: "'Andad' constitutes shirk. It is a crime less detectable than the crawling of ants on a black surface at night. It is to fall into it to say, even casually, to your friend, 'By Allah, by your life, O friend' or 'By my life! etc; or 'where it not for our little dog' or 'the ducks in our yard, the thieves would have broken through [the house]!' or 'were it not for Allah and you, O Friend,' etc. Do not mention anybody with Allah, if you want to avoid shirk." Tirmidi related from Umar ibn al Khattab that RasulAllah (saw) said: "To swear by any other than Allah is shirk or unfaith." (Tirmidhi; Nasai; Ibn Majah; Darimi; Ahmad; Hakim) This hadith was corrected and polished by al Hakim." Ibn Mas'ud said: "I would prefer to swear by Allah and lie than swear by another being and tell the Truth." Abu Dawud related, with valid isnad, from Hudhayfah (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) said: "Do not say 'How wonderful that Allah has willed it, and you willed it'; but 'How wonderful that Allah has willed it first, and then that you willed it'." Ibrahim al-Nakh'i said: "I hate the statement, 'I recourse to Allah and to you.' It is permissible to say: 'I recourse to Allah first, and then to you, or 'where it not for Allah first and then for you,' but not 'where it not for Allah and you!'" After relating this Muhammad ibn Abdulwahab gives more explanation and further issues: "The Companions understood the verse condemning the greater shirk as inclusive of the lesser. Swearing by other than Allah is shirk. Swearing by other than Allah in truth is greater crime than false swearing. The difference between "and" and "then" (in swearing)." (Kitabu Tawhid)

There are many dangers of minor shirk -and for this reason it is prohibited harshly- among them are:

It is risking prohibition of entrance to Heaven. Performing righteous acts for human praise can also lead

to being barred from entering paradise.

Abu Hurayrah (ra) quoted RasulAllah (saw) as saying: "Whoever gains any knowledge that should be learnt for the sake of Allah, (with) the intention of (benefit in) this world will not even smell the fragrance of Paradise on the Day of Judgement." (Abu-Dawud; Ibn-Majah)

It causes weakening of iman and tawhid. By committing 'riyaa', a person destroys the very purpose of his creation - to worship Allah alone - since instead of truly worshipping Allah, he pretends to worship Allah while seeking to achieve the pleasure and praise of the creation of Allah. Allah describes the true believers as those who perform their acts of worship solely for the sake of Allah, not desiring reward nor thanks from others for their deeds. Allah says:

"And they give food, despite their love for it, to Miskin(poor), the orphan, and the captive. (Saying): "We feed you seeking Allah's Countenance only. We wish for no reward, nor thanks from you. "Verily, We fear from our Lord a Day, hard and distressful, that will make the faces look horrible (from extreme dislikeness to it)." (Insan 76/8-10)

In direct contrast to this, Allah (swt) says about the hypocrites:

"So woe unto those performers of prayers (hypocrites). Who delay their prayers from their stated fixed times. Those who do good deeds only to be seen (of men)." (Maun 107/4-6)

It increases misguidance. There is no doubt that the person who commits riyaa' has a disease in his heart, and if this disease is not cured, it will lead to further problems. In this regard, Allah says,

"They (try to) deceive Allah and those who believe, but they only deceive themselves and do not even realize it! In their hearts is a disease (of doubt and hypocrisy), and Allah has increased their disease...." (al-Baqarah 2/9-10)

It deprives deeds of blessings. RasulAllah (saw) has informed in a number of his statements that Allah will not accept actions done for the sake of others.

Mahmud bin Labid related that RasulAllah (saw) said: "Allah the Exalted, will say (to those who practiced riyaa') when He is taking account of people's deeds (on the Day of Judgement). 'Go to those whom you used to show off your deeds to, and see if you will find any reward with them!'" (Sahih at Targheeb wat-Tarheeb)

The previous explanations help to make the rulings for this important issue clearer to you. And Allah knows best.

b- The hadith of the slave girl which was tested by RasulAllah (saw)

Regarding RasulAllah (saw)'s method to test individuals in order to learn about their iman has been mentioned by Imam Shaafii in 'Sha nu ma sannahu ar-Rasul fi kulli man imtahanahum li'l iman':

The report of Muawiyah Ibn al-Hakam (ra), who said, 'I had a servant girl, who used to tend my sheep in the area of mount Uhud... One day, I came to see them only to find out that a wolf had made off with a sheep from her flock... (for which) ...I gave her a terrible slap in her face. When I came to RasulAllah (saw) with the story, he considered it to be a grave thing for me to have done so. I said, 'O RasulAllah (saw), couldn't I free her?' He replied, 'Bring her to me.' So I brought her. He (saw) then asked her, 'Where is Allah?' She replied, 'above the sky.' He (saw) then asked her, 'Who am I?' and she replied, 'You are Allah's Messenger.' So, RasulAllah (saw) said, 'Free her for she is a true believer.' (Imam Shafii, ar-Risala, 75)

This hadith is presented as evidence to ignorance being an excuse in tawhid and they say although the servant had no knowledge of tawhid was not made takfir of and was accepted among the muslimen because RasulAllah (saw) had not asked her anything regarding kalimat tawhid nor did he teach her about kalimat tawhid.

This is a great mistake for the reason that just because RasulAllah (saw) did not ask her about the kalimat tawhid this does not mean that the servant did not know the meaning of the kalimat tawhid. On the contrary this is evidence that she knew about tawhid.

RasulAllah (saw) had known that the servant knew the meaning of kalimat tawhid and for this reason asked her something else. If RasulAllah (saw) had known the servant was ignorant in regards to the meaning of la ilahailaAllah the first question he would ask her would most certainly be regarding this. The reason for this is because it is much more important than the matter of knowing where Allah is. Knowing that Allah is above the sky is not a matter of asluddeen. Regarding this matter there are different groups which hold different views. (The Ashari are among them, they make ta'weel of this hadith and do not accept that Allah is above the skies. The reason is according to them the statement Allah is above the skies means to appoint a certain place for Allah where as Allah is munazzah from makan (location/place).)

It is understood from this that this hadith can not be used as evidence for the ignorant to be excused from major shirk which takes one out of the fold of Islam. Also Ata ibn Yasar who narrated this hadith from Muawiya ibn Hakam as-Salmi from a more sahih chain had narrated RasulAllah (saw) asked the servant: "Do you testify that there is no one else worthy of worship other than Allah and that I am the Rasul of Allah?" This chain of the hadith is more sahih than the prior version. This narration is mentioned in the Musannaf of Abdurrazzak volume 9 pg 175. Also pg 777 of Muwatta and by other narrators with sahih sanad.

c- Anas b Nadr (ra) and his opposition to the hukm of RasulAllah (saw)

It is narrated from Anas (ra): "Ar-Rabi, the daughter of An-Nadr broke the tooth of a girl, and the

relatives of Ar-Rabi' requested the girl's relatives to accept the Irsh (compensation for wounds etc.) and forgive (the offender), but they refused. So, they went to RasulAllah who ordered them to bring about retaliation. Anas bin An-Nadr asked, "O RasulAllah! Will the tooth of Ar-Rabi' be broken? No, by Him Who has sent you with the Truth, her tooth will not be broken." RasulAllah said, "O Anas! Allah's law ordains retaliation." Later the relatives of the girl agreed and forgave her. RasulAllah said, "There are some of Allah's slaves who, if they take an oath by Allah, are responded to by Allah i.e. their oath is fulfilled). Anas added, "The people agreed and accepted the Irsh." (Bukhari; Ibn Majah; al-Busti)

Individuals bring this hadith as evidence to ignorance being an excuse in asluddeen because due to his ignorance Anas ibn Nadr objected to the hukm of RasulAllah (saw). Regardless of this RasulAllah (saw) did not do anything but only taught him the matter because he had been ignorant. Wa a'udhu billah.

Think for the sake of Allah! O how the hadith of RasulAllah is being made ta'weel of according to hawa! Those which are not in the hadith are being added and with a meaning no scholar had meant assumptions are made and it is stated that Anas ibn Nadr had opposed the hukm of RasulAllah!

How could you possibly pass judgment that Anas ibn Nadr (ra) had opposed RasulAllah out of ignorance and regardless of this RasulAllah accounted him ignorant for his action and did not punish him rather only taught him his ignorance? Has this hadith informed anything that could be evidence for this? Has any worthy scholar among the scholars held this thought? Or have any among them state what you have stated? Who has told you that due to his ignorance Anas ibn Nadr opposed the hukm of RasulAllah, that RasulAllah did not punish him he also excused him for being ignorant and taught him only his ignorance? Surely this is nothing but hawa! From this one can only take refuge in Allah.

Anas ibn Nadr had certainly not opposed the hukm of RasulAllah. The statement he made in the hadith had not been made because he was not aware of the fact that it is waajib to submit to the hukm of Allah and His Rasul. The retaliation had not been stated for the purpose of rejecting or opposing the hukm because the only hukm of Allah is not sole retaliation.

Here when the wali of the injured is in acceptance the hukm of diyah is mentionable. Anas ibn Nadr only had made husnu dhan so that Allah would accept his own dua and make the wali of the injured accept the diyah or forgive Rabia the aunt of Anas. For this purpose he stated: "O RasulAllah! No, by Him Who has sent you with the Truth, her tooth will not be broken."

The statement of RasulAllah at the end of the hadith is also evidence for this; RasulAllah said, "There are some of Allah's slaves who, if they take an oath by Allah, are responded to by Allah i.e. their oath is fulfilled).

Upon the crime of the aunt of Anas Rabia being known with certainty and the relatives requesting retaliation RasulAllah passed hukm –qisas- which was the hukm of Allah. The reason is because he could not command with diyah unless the relatives of the injured had accepted it. However Anas ibn Nadr said: "her tooth shall not be broken" Meaning 'surely I hope that Allah will make her relatives content

with diyah and that her tooth is not broken” Or else the meaning of the statement of Anas is not “No RasulAllah! I do not accept this hukm. I am not content with her tooth being broken. Because she is an honorable woman, her tooth can not be broken.” Surely Anas knew the true meaning of such opposition. He certainly did not do this. Only a munafiq individual or an individual who does not know the meaning of his statements would do such thing.

Anas saying to RasulAllah: “her tooth shall not be broken” Meant ‘surely I hope that Allah will make her relatives content with diyah and that her tooth is not broken’. However because the relatives acceptance of diyah was that of gayb and because the relatives requested retaliation first RasulAllah (saw) said to Anas: "O Anas! Allah’s law ordains retaliation." Meaning as long as the relatives do not agree with diyah the retaliation hukm of Allah will be performed. Later the relatives accepted diyah. Upon this RasulAllah (saw) said: "There are some of Allah's slaves who, if they take an oath by Allah, are responded to by Allah (i.e. their oath is fulfilled).

According to the narration in the Bukhari the following was revealed concerning Anas bin An-Nadr (ra) and other men of his sort 'Among the believers are men who have been true to their covenant with Allah.' Narrated by Anas (ra) that he said: “My uncle Anas bin An-Nadr was absent from the Battle of Badr. He said, "O RasulAllah! I was absent from the first battle you fought against the pagans. (By Allah) if Allah gives me a chance to fight the pagans, no doubt. Allah will see how (bravely) I will fight." On the day of Uhud when the Muslims turned their backs and fled, he said, "O Allah! I apologize to You for what these (i.e. his companions) have done, and I denounce what these (i.e. the pagans) have done." Then he advanced and Sad bin Muadh met him. He said "O Sad bin Muadh! By the Lord of An-Nadr, Paradise! I am smelling its aroma coming from before (the mountain of) Uhud," Later on Sad said, "O RasulAllah! I cannot achieve or do what he (i.e. Anas bin An-Nadr) did. We found more than eighty wounds by swords and arrows on his body. We found him dead and his body was mutilated so badly that none except his sister could recognize him by his fingers." We used to think that the following Verse was revealed concerning him and other men of his sort: "Among the believers are men who have been true to their covenant with Allah." (al-Ahzab 33/23) His sister Ar-Rubbaya' broke a front tooth of a woman and Allah's Apostle ordered for retaliation. On that Anas (bin An-Nadr) said, "O Allah's Apostle! By Him Who has sent you with the Truth, my sister's tooth shall not be broken." Then the opponents of Anas's sister accepted the compensation and gave up the claim of retaliation. So Allah's Apostle said, "There are some people amongst Allah's slaves whose oaths are fulfilled by Allah when they take them." (Bukhari)

d- Doubts regarding the statements of Aisha (raa)

One other example is the mistaken conclusion taken from the hadith of Aisha (raa) regarding ‘Ilm. According to a narration by Muslim from his Sahih:

“Muhammad b. Qais said (to the people): Should I not narrate to you (a hadith of RasulAllah) on my authority and on the authority of my mother? We thought that he meant the mother who had given him birth. He (Muhammad b. Qais) then reported that it was Aisha who had narrated this: Should I not narrate to you about myself and about RasulAllah (saw)? We said: Yes. She said: When it was my turn for RasulAllah (saw) to spend the night with me, he (saw) turned his side,

put on his mantle and took off his shoes and placed them near his feet, and spread the corner of his shawl on his bed and then lay down till he thought that I had gone to sleep. He (saw) took hold of his mantle slowly and put on the shoes slowly, and opened the door and went out and then closed it lightly. I covered my head, put on my veil and tightened my waist wrapper, and then went out following his steps till he reached Baqi (graveyard). He (saw) stood there and he stood for a long time. He (saw) then lifted his hands three times, and then returned and I also returned. He (saw) hastened his steps and I also hastened my steps. He (saw) ran and I too ran. He (saw) came (to the house) and I also came (to the house). I, however, preceded him and I entered (the house), and as I lay down in the bed, he (saw) entered the (house), and said: Why is it, O Aisha, that you are out of breath? I said: There is nothing. He (saw) said: Tell me or (Allah) the Subtle and the Aware would inform me. I said: RasulAllah, may my father and mother be ransom for you, and then I told him (the whole story). He (saw) said: Was it the darkness (of your shadow) that I saw in front of me? I said: Yes. He (saw) struck me on the chest which caused me pain, and then said: Did you think that Allah and His Apostle would deal unjustly with you? She said: Whatsoever the people conceal, Allah will know it. He said: Jibril came to me when you saw me. He called me and he concealed it from you. I responded to his call, but I too concealed it from you (for he did not come to you), as you were not fully dressed. I thought that you had gone to sleep, and I did not like to awaken you, fearing that you may be frightened. He (Jibril) said: Your Lord has commanded you to go to the inhabitants of Baqi (to those lying in the graves) and beg pardon for them. I said: RasulAllah, how should I pray for them (How should I beg forgiveness for them)? He (saw) said: Say, Peace be upon the inhabitants of this city (graveyard) from among the Believers and the Muslims, and may Allah have mercy on those who have gone ahead of us, and those who come later on, and we shall, Allah willing, join you.” (Muslim; Ahmad)

According to their claim; here mother of the believers, Aisha (raa) is asking whether Allah knows everything. To deny that Allah knows everything is like denying that He is capable of all things. Nevertheless, her question did not make her a disbeliever. Although she doubted regarding the ilm of Allah she did not become kafir because she was ignorant.

SubhanAllah!

This hadith narrated from Aisha (raa) in the Sahih of Muslim under the heading Kitab’ul Janaiz, Bab ma yukalu inde duhulu’l kabr (bab #35) hadith # 103 (974) it also has been narrated differently by Nasai (Kitabul Janaiz and Kitabu Ashratun Nasai), Ibn Hibban (7110), Abdu’r-Razzak (III, 570-571), and Ahmad (VI, 221).

In all narrations there is no question Aisha (raa) asks RasulAllah (saw). On the contrary her statement is in the matter of “Whatsoever the people conceal, Allah will know it.” This word at the beginning of this statement mahma is Hurufu shartiya (conditional proposition) and not an inquiry proposition. Along with this the word naam (yes) which comes in the continuation of the hadith can only be used after an inquiry. For this reason her statement “Whatsoever the people conceal, Allah will know it” could be considered as an inquiry. In a narration by Nasai and Ibn Hibban while the word naam (yes) had not been used at all in another narration by Nasai and Ahmad ibn Hanbal it is seen that the word naam belongs to RasulAllah (saw).

Nawawi stated: “Aisha said: ‘Whatsoever the people conceal, yes Allah will know it.’ It is as such in usul. This is sahih. It is as when she was saying when people would hide from him Allah would teach him, her nafs approved this and in continuation she said naam.” (Nawawi, 7/44)

From the beginning to the end of this hadith where is the doubt in Aisha (raa)’s acts? Whereas her statement of ‘Whatsoever the people conceal, Allah will know it’ is a statement which is a statement of ilm. Let alone as Nawawi had stated it is as such in usul also.

For instance if Aisha (raa) had been in doubt regarding this matter (wa a’udhu billah) than why did not RasulAllah (saw) correct the situation. If we are to say this was due to the ignorance of Aisha (raa) as an answer we will say: Surely Nabi (saw) had rejected that which the tribe which had newly entered Islam had done and requested in the incident of dhat anwat. He (saw) had equated them to the Banu Isra’il with their statement ‘make us an idol like theirs’.

It is narrated by Imam Ahmad in his Musnad from ibnu Abbas demonstrates this matter similarly: A companion of RasulAllah (saw) once said to him: “It is as Allah wills and you will.” Upon this RasulAllah (saw) immediately responded ‘are you making me equal to Allah?’ (Say) as Allah alone wills.” Fundamentally only the catastrophe of ignorance had led them to this. When it is as such why did not RasulAllah (saw) reject Aisha (raa) immediately? Let alone she had been raised in the home of nubuwwah, that home which the ayah of the book and hikmah had been recited. Moreover InshaAllah she had been Muslim since the era of Macca meaning she was not a new Muslim.

In the hadith there is not a single detraction which is incumbent on his words that his nafs attests to. Fundamentally as known to delay the explanation when it is necessary is not permissible (without ikhtilaf among the ulamaa). (Ibn Hazm, al-Muhalla, 11/218)

1- It is not permissible to delay the explanation (of the ruling) from the time when it is needed

It is one of the fundamental principles that “It is not permissible to delay explanation of an issue when there is need for this.”

Ibn Qudamah stated: “There is no ikhtilaf that it is not permissible to delay an explanation when it is necessary.” (Rawdatu’n-Nazir wa Jannatu’l-Manadhir, 96)

Regarding the delay of bayan at a time of necessity Shawkani states: “Know that when the explanation of any matter regarding an act that is mujmal (unclear), umumi (general), majaz (Metaphor), mushtarak (homonym), muhtalif (various) and mutlaq (absolute) two situations can be mentionable:

1- The explanation being left to another time than when it is needed; this is such time that if it is left to a time later when needed, the mukallaf will not be capable of learning that which the statement (act) comprises. This situation of postponing is never permissible in the waajib which must be performed at that instant. The reason is because it is not possible to perform that which information regarding it is not present. Likewise this is not possible according to everyone who believes there is no responsibility (taklifi mala yutak) one cannot overcome. Those who make taklifi mala yutak permissible state this is

only permissible but never occurs. This not occurring is accepted by both sides.

For this reason Abu Bakir al-Bakillani had narrated that the ahl shairah made ijma that this was impossible.

Ibn Samani stated: There is no ikhtilaf that it is not appropriate the explanation is left to a time after the act is performed however it is permissible the explanation could be left to the time the act will be performed.” (Irshadu’l-Fuhul, 173)

When it comes to the difference between the necessary time and time of explanation; the ulama had made ittifaq: It is not permissible that the explanation is left to time rather than the time needed.

Meaning the time when it is necessary to perform the act according to the sharee'ah. However many scholars stated it is permissible to delay the explanation regarding the fard, from the time of hitab until the time it must be performed. The difference between the two is very clear.

It is openly known that the explanations regarding the akidah must be done immediately. The reason is because this is a necessity of i'tiqad and also a condition of iman from the time one enters deen.

In the mentioned hadith RasulAllah (saw) does not condemn Aisha (raa) for her statement. This means that it (what she had stated) did not have any inconvenience in sharee'ah. This shows that the explanation not made at the time of need is; not an explanation needed.

e- Doubts related with the Prostration of Mua'dh (ra)

Qurtubi relates the narration while giving the tafsir of Baqara 34 which is recorded by Ibn Majah and al-Busti: “It is narrated from Abu Wakid that when Muadh ibn Jabal (ra) came from Shaam (the area comprising Syria, Jordan, Palestine and Lebanon today), he prostrated to RasulAllah (saw). RasulAllah said, ‘What is this, O Muadh?’ He said, ‘I came from Shaam and I observed them doing so, so I loved for myself that we should do so to you.’ Then RasulAllah (saw) said, ‘Do not do that. Truly, if I were to order anyone that he should do other than Allah, I would have ordered that the wife prostrate to her husband. By the one in whose hand is the life of Muhammad, the woman does not love the right of her Lord, until she loves the right of her husband, even if he asks for her and she is at the oven cooking’.” (Ibn Majah; al-Busti, Sahih; Qurtubi, Tafsir; Ibn Hibban; Hakim; Tirmidhi)

Some take this hadith as evidence and claim that Muadh prostrated to RasulAllah therefore he worshipped him. Although he performed an act of kufr and indeed this is shirk RasulAllah (saw) excused him due to him being ignorant regarding the hukm of the issue and due to him having good intentions. As seen this absurd ideology made them slander a sahabah to have performed shirk akbar and moreover slander RasulAllah (saw) for not making takfir of him. Their claim can be summarized as: There is no doubt that prostration to anyone other than Allah is an act of kufr, but RasulAllah did not say that Muadh had disbelieved. Rather, he excused him due to his ignorance of the fact that prostration to anyone other than Allah, even to a Prophet, is absolutely forbidden.

First of all, one of the things that are well known in Islam and that no Muslim has any excuse for not knowing is that it is not permissible to do any kind of act that is worship for anyone except Allah – not to any angel who is close to Him or to any Prophet who was sent. Whoever does any kind of act of worship for anyone other than Allah is a mushrik and a kafir.

RasulAllah (saw) warned us against standing up for him. It says in the hadith referring to the time when he led them in prayer sitting down because he was ill, and they were standing, so he gestured to them to sit down: “Just now you nearly did the action of the Persians and Romans, who stand up for their kings whilst they (the kings) are sitting.” (Muslim) And it says in the hadith: “Do not do as the Persians do for their leaders.” (Sahih al-Jami)

After this explanation we find it beneficial to mention some merits of Muadh (ra) so everyone may have better understanding about the issue and his character.

“Muadh Ibn Jabal's (ra) full name was Ibn Amr Ibn Aws al-Ansari al-Khazraji Abu Abdur Rahman. He was one of the noblest companions of Prophet Muhammad (saw). He witnessed Badr and the battles that followed. He was the most knowledgeable one among all the companions in regard to legal rulings and the interpretation of the Qur'an. RasulAllah (saw) said: ‘Mu'adh will be resurrected on the Day of Judgment as preceding the scholars by a step.’ It was said: ‘Mu'adh will precede the scholars by the length of an arrow's shot or by a mile or within eyeshot.’ Mu'adh (ra) died in 18 A.H. during the plague of Amwas in Syria. RasulAllah (saw) appointed him as his viceroy over the people of Makkah to teach them the matters of religion...Ibn Taymiyyah said: "Among the virtues of Muadh (ra) is that RasulAllah (saw) sent him to Yemen to convey the message from him and to be a preacher, teacher and ruler on his behalf." (Fathu'l-Majeed)

RasulAllah (saw) said about Muadh ibn Jabal (ra): "Verily, when the people of knowledge will be present before their Lord (swt) Muadh will be one step ahead of them." (Ibn Sa'd; Abu Nu'aim; Tabarani) He (saw) also said about Muadh: "...the most knowledgeable of them (my Ummah) about the lawful and the prohibited is Muadh bin Jabal..." (Tirmidhi, Ibn Hibbaan, ibn Majah, Bayhaqi, Hakim, who declared it Sahih, and adh-Dhahabi agreed with him.)

In the letter which RasulAllah (saw) wrote to the people of Yemen, he said: “I am sending you the one who has the most knowledge and the one, who knows his deen the most, among my companions.” (Ibn Sad, Tabakat, 3/587) Ibn Kathir recorded in al-Bidaya that Muadh always had been sent to other tribes as a messenger and if more than one sahabah had sent to a place, Muadh would have been their leaders. And also Ibn Ishaq stated in his Sirah that RasulAllah (saw) left Muadh as a teacher in Mecca after Mecca had been conquered. He was mentioned by RasulAllah (saw) as one of the four people to whom one shall learn the Qur'an from. (Muslim) And also he was known as the one of four people who collected the Qur'an during the lifetime of RasulAllah (saw). (Muslim)

Ibn Taymiyyah writes in al-Wasiyyah: "Part of Muadh's excellence further is that RasulAllah (saw) sent

him to the people of Yemen as a preacher on his behalf, a caller, a teacher of understanding in the Deen, a giver of religious verdicts, and a judge." This is Muadh (ra) to who RasulAllah (saw) also said: "O Muadh! By Allah, truly I love you." (Abu Dawud, Nasai, ibn Hibban, Abu Nu'aym, Ibn Khuzaimah and Hakim, who declared its isnad to be sahih, and adh-Dhahabi agreed)

Ibn Mas'ud (ra) said about Muadh (ra): "He was true in Faith, and bowed his will to Allah's, and he joined not gods with Allah." When he was asked: "These are things which are attributed to Ibrahim (as) in the Qur'an" he resembled Muadh to Ibrahim (as) and said: "Muadh was also the same; he knew the khair and submitted to the khair, he obeyed Allah and RasulAllah (saw)" (Usdul-Ghaba 5/197)

Abu Nu'aym reports some sayings of Muadh himself about the excellence of knowledge, among which we find the following: "Knowledge is a comforting friend in times of loneliness, it is the best companion during travels, and it is the inner friend who speaks to you in your privacy. Knowledge is the discerning proof of what is right and what is wrong, and it is the positive force that will help you surmount the trials of comfort, as well as those of hardships. Knowledge is your most powerful sword against your enemy, and finally, it is your most dignifying raiment in the company of your close companions." "Through knowledge, Allah, blessed be His Name, raises some people in rank, and He makes them leaders in righteousness and models in morality. The vestige of their faith is avidly sought, their deeds are emulated perceptively, and people will seek and sanction their opinions solicitously and unequivocally. The heavenly angels seek their company and anoint them with their wings, every fresh or withered life they pass by implore Almighty Allah to forgive them their sins, even the fish in the oceans, the beasts of the lands and every bird of prey and migratory bird pray and solicit the mercy of Almighty Allah on their behalf. This is because knowledge revives the dead hearts and drives them out of darkness into light, and because knowledge is the light of the inner eyes that cures one's blindness and restores his inner sight." (al-Hilya)

1- The difference between the sujuud of tahiyya/tadhim (salam/ honouring) and the sujuud of ibadaah

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) said: "Prostration is a form of humility, so the prostration which includes all creatures implies the utmost submission and humility. For every created thing submits to His greatness and humbles itself before His might and power. This does not mean that everything prostrates like human beings do, on seven parts of the body, putting the forehead on the ground. This kind of prostration is only for human beings. Some other nations bow but do not prostrate, and that is their prostration. Allah says: 'and enter the gate in prostration (or bowing with humility) and say: "Forgive us"' (al-Baqarah 2/58) It was said that this means enter it bowing, and some of them prostrate on their sides like the Jews. Sujood (prostration) is a generic term but because the way in which Muslims prostrate is so well known, many people think that this is how everything prostrates." (Jaami al-Rasaa'il, 1/27)

Saffarini stated that Sujud has several meanings, such as bending, making in'hinaa, humbleness, modesty and greeting. He quoted the linguist Abu Yusuf, Ya`qub Ibn Is`haq Ibn as-Sikkit, as saying that it is said that one has made Sujud if one (at least) lowered (or nodded) his head or went to the extent of

placing the face on the ground (prostrates). (Ghidhaa al-Albab fi Shar`h Mandhumat al-Adaab)

Ruku was also mentioned in the context of Sujud in this ayah, “And Dawud guessed that We have tried him and he sought forgiveness of his Lord, and he fell down in ruku and turned (to Allah) in repentance” (Sad 38/24). Ibn Taymiyyah, stated that in this ayah, Prophet Dawud (as) made sujud. (al-Fatawa 23/145) Sujud was mentioned in the context of Ruku in the Ayah, “And (remember) when it was said to them (Children of Israel): “Dwell in this town (Jerusalem) and eat therefrom wherever you wish, and say, ‘(O, Allâh) forgive our sins’; and enter the gate Sujjadan (making Sujud)” (Araf 7/161). Ibn Taimiyyah said that several scholars of tafsir stated that the Children of Israel were ordered to enter the vicinity of the Masjid while making Ruku, i.e., bowing down, since entering while prostrating on the ground is not possible.” (Fatawa, 21/269)

There are several types of Sujud mentioned in the Qur’an and ahadith distinguished from each other by their linguistic implication and the intention behind performing each type.

Sujud, in the context of worship, is only dedicated to Allah, alone without partners. This type of Sujud is of two categories classified either under Shirk or Tawhid, as follows. It may be an act of veneration and drawing closer to the one to whom one prostrates. This kind of prostration is worship, and should only be done for Allah, according to the laws of the Prophets. Prostration of worship for other than Allah entails associating partners with Allah (shirk). The prostration of worship (sajda al-ibadaah), for other than Allah, is absolutely and undeniably kufr.

The Hudhud (Hoopoe) shows that the Sujud of the people of Saba to the sun was in the context of worship and Tawhid is dedicating all aspects of worship to Allah, Alone without partners. The Hudhud said the following to Sulaiman (as), “I found a woman ruling over them (people of Saba), she has been given all things that could be possessed by any ruler of the earth, and she has a great throne. I found her and her people prostrating (‘Yasjudun’, verb for, ‘Sujud’) to the sun instead of Allah, and Shaitan has made their deeds fair seeming to them, and has barred them from (Allah’s) way, so they have no guidance; So they do not worship (prostrate themselves before) Allah, Who brings to light what is hidden in the heavens and the earth, and knows what you conceal and what you reveal. Allah, La ilaha illa Huwa (none has the right to be worshipped but He), the Lord of the Supreme Throne!” (an-Naml 27/22-26)

The Qur’an affirmed this type of sujud as an act of worship, in this case, shirk; after a few sentences and in direct reference to the Sujud of the Saba people to the sun “And that which she used to worship besides Allah has prevented her (from Islam), for she was of a disbelieving people.” (an-Naml 27/43).

There is the second category of Sujud in the context of worship; among the Qur’anic Verses are the statements of Allah (awj): “O, you who have believed! Bow down, and prostrate yourselves, and worship your Lord and do good that you may be successful. And strive hard in Allah’s cause as you ought to strive (with sincerity). He has chosen you (to convey Islamic Monotheism to mankind), and has not laid upon you in religion any hardship: it is the religion of your father Ibrahim. It is He Who has named you

Muslims both before and in this (the Qur'an), that the Messenger (Muhammad) may be a witness over you and you be witnesses over mankind! So perform as Salat (Iqâmat as Salât), give Zakât and hold fast to Allah [i.e. have confidence and trust in Allah." (al-Hajj 22/77-78)

The context of the following verse is the obedience to Allah's Qadar (Divine Preordainments and Predestination), which is another meaning for Sujud, not prostrating to Allah by placing the face on the ground. Proof for this is the sun, the moon, the mountains, the trees and the animals do not prostrate in the manner many of mankind and the Jinn and all of the angels willingly prostrate. "See you not that whoever is in the heavens and whoever is on the earth, and the sun, and the moon, and the stars, and the mountains, and the trees, and Ad Dawâbb [moving (living) creatures, beasts], and many of mankind prostrate themselves to Allah" (al-Hajj 22/18). Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) stated: "It is known that everything prostrates according to its nature, and the prostration of these created entities does not mean that they put their foreheads on the ground." (Majmu al-Fatawa, 21/284)

Now at this point we can ask 'How can every type of Sujud be disallowed (meaning an act of worship), when the animals, which do not worship Allah, used to make Sujud to RasulAllah (saw)?" There is well known hadith that wherein a camel is reported to have made sujud to RasulAllah (saw), in the presence of RasulAllah's companions. (Sahih at-Targhib wa-t-Tarhib)

There is another type of Sujud that is a matter of Shar'ah (Islamic Law). The second type is a type of greeting and honouring a person. This is the type of prostration which Allah commanded the angels to do in the case of Adam, so they prostrated to him as an act of honouring him. It was an act of worship towards Allah on their part, because they were obeying His command to prostrate to Adam.

To explain this type, we should say that the Qur'an did not only state that the angels were ordered to make Sujud to Adam, but also mentioned the reason behind this Divine Commandment. Allah said, "So the angels prostrated themselves, all of them. Except Iblîs (Satan), he was proud and was one of the disbelievers. (Allâh) said: "O Iblîs (Satan)! What prevents you from prostrating yourself to one whom I have created with Both My Hands. Are you too proud (to fall prostrate to Adam) or are you one of the high exalted?" [Iblîs (Satan)] said: "I am better than he. You created me from fire, and You created him from clay" (Sad 38/73-76) "So the angels prostrated themselves, all of them together. Except Iblîs (Satan) — he refused to be among the prostrators" (al-Hijr 15/30-31)

The type of Sujud that Allah ordered the angels to perform before Adam, as well as, the Sujud that Prophet Yaqub made to Prophet Yusuf, is a matter of Law (Ahkam, or Shar'ah), not a matter of worship. When Islam came, many of the laws of previous nations were abrogated, among them the Sujud which is performed to honor kings and leaders. Ever since Islam disallowed it, making any type of Sujud to other than Allah, regardless of the intention behind it, even if it were to honor kings and leaders as was the tradition before Islam, became prohibited for Muslims.

The prostration of Yusuf's parents and brothers was also a prostration of tahiyya (greeting and honouring), which was permissible according to the law (of Allah) at that time. But according to the

shari'ah brought by RasulAllah (saw) it is not permissible to prostrate to anyone at all except to Allah. The prohibition in this sharee'ah against prostrating to anyone at all except to Allah is an aspect of its perfection in achieving true Tawhid. It is the perfect sharee'ah whose perfection is manifested in all its rulings.

As evidence that making Sujud as a matter of tradition was popular during the time of RasulAllah (saw). Bukhari reported that when RasulAllah (saw) sent a messenger to Hercules, the Roman Emperor, Hercules had a lengthy discussion with his advisors about RasulAllah (saw) and afterwards, the priests prostrated before Hercules. This occurred in the presence of the RasulAllah's companion who carried RasulAllah's letter to Hercules. RasulAllah's companion did not interpret this as an act of worship by the Christian advisors and priests to their Christian king, but as a matter of tradition and habit.

We should add that Muadh Ibn Jabal stated that the Sujud he witnessed was the practice of Christians during that era, and indeed, the Christians still practice this Sujud in the present time as they bow down to their kings or queens, and even bow down to kiss the hands of their popes and patriarchs. In yet another proof that this Sujud was a matter of tradition, Imam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal reported in another narration that Muadh Ibn Jabal said to RasulAllah (saw): "I thought that you have more right to be honored (than the priests and patriarchs)."

In addition, the type of Sujud that RasulAllah (saw) said he would have ordered the wife to perform to her husband, was explained by RasulAllah himself in that it was due the husband's great right on his wife; (Sahih at-Targhib). In another narration reported in, Sahih at-Targhib RasulAllah (saw) further explained this hadith by saying, "Because of what Allah favored (or, honored) him with above her."

Waliyullah al-Dihlawi said: "You should know that worship is the utmost act of humbleness. The utmost humbling of oneself before another must be either through the form, for example one standing while another prostrates, or through the intend, in which one intends by this act the honoring of the master on the part of servants; like the way that subjects honor their king, or pupils respects their teachers. There is no other type beside these two. Since it is established that the angels prostrated to salute (sujud al-tahiyya) Adam (as) and that the brothers of Yusuf (as) prostrated to Yusuf (as) and that prostration is the highest form of giving respect, it necessarily follows there is no physical distinction between the acts of prostration that is between the prostration of worshipping Allah (sujud al-ibadah) and that of respect for a creature (sujud al-tahiyya) except through their intention." (Hujjatillahu'l-Baligha, Chapter 38, 179)

Imam Shawkani said: "When it comes to the statement: 'this is prostrating to other than Allah' it must be clarified that the one who prostrates to other than Allah is accepting the Lordship of it therefore prostrates with this intention. If it is performed with this aim then he commits shirk to Allah and he takes others as ilahs besides Allah. However without intending this, if he carries the intention of respect (sujud al-tahiyya) and (Sujud al-tadhim) reverence (as the ones who kiss the floor when they enter to the presence of the kings) then this is not kufr." (Saylul Jarrar, 4/580)

Now we understand that the term sujud has two usages (shari and linguistic). It refers to placing the head to the ground in the terms of Islamic usage. Its linguistic usage refers to bowing down and to bend. Although there is ikhtilaf among the mufassir regarding the how of the sujud which is referred to in the Qur'an, the majority says it is placing head to the ground. Ulama of tafsir explained these meanings while giving explanations of the ayah which are related with sujud.

Wahidi said in the tafsir of al-Baqarah 2/34: "We command them to make sujud to him due to revering and greeting him. The sujud here is not placing the head to the ground but bowing down." (al-Wajiz Fi Tafsiril Kitabil Aziz) He also said the following while explaining the ayah Yusuf 12/100: "They all made sujud of tahiyya (greeting). This is bowing down before him." (al-Wajiz Fi Tafsiril Kitabil Aziz)

Qurtubi in the tafsir of Yusuf 12/100 stated: "The scholars of tafsir accepted with ijma that this sujud is not of worship but the sujud of tahiyya." (tafsir)

Zamakshari said: "Sujud for Allah is due to worship. Sujud other than to Him is due to respect and reverence. Sujud of the Angels to Adam, sujud of Yaqub and his sons to Yusuf is of this type." (Kashshaf 1/95)

Tabari stated the following in the tafsir of al-Baqarah 2/34: "Sujud of the angels to Adam was not due to worship, but to show their respect to him and submitting to the command of Allah." (tafsir)

Fakhruddin ar-Razi in the same ayah said: "All the Muslim agreed that this was not a sujud of ibadaah. The reason is because performing sujud of ibadaah other than to Allah is kufr. And kufr would not be commanded." And then he continues to explain the different types of sujud. He gives the incident of Muadh as an example of sujud of tahiyya. (tafsir)

In the tafsir of al-Baqarah 2/34 it is stated in Tafsir al-Jalalayn: "And, mention, when We said to the angels, 'Prostrate yourselves to Adam', a prostration that is a bow of salutation" (Tafsir al-Jalalayn)

Ibn Abbas also commented in the same manner: "And when We said unto the angels: Prostrate yourselves before Adam, a prostration of salutation" (Tanwir al-Miqbas min Tafsir Ibn Abbas)

Ibn Kathir said: "Qatadah commented on Allah's statement, And (remember) when We said to the angels: 'Prostrate yourselves before Adam. 'The obedience was for Allah and the prostration was before Adam. Allah honored Adam and commanded the angels to prostrate before him.' Some people said that this prostration was just a prostration of greeting, peace and honor, hence Allah's statement, 'And he (Prophet Yusuf) raised his parents to the throne and they fell down before him prostrate. And he said: 'O my father! This is the interpretation of my dream aforetime! My Lord has made it come true!'" (Yusuf 12/100) The practice of prostrating was allowed for previous nations, but was repealed for ours. Muadh said to RasulAllah: "I visited Ash-Sham and found that they used to prostrate before their priests and scholars. You, RasulAllah, are more deserving of prostration." RasulAllah (saw) said: "No. If I was to command any human to prostrate before another human, I would command the wife to

prostrate before her husband because of the enormity of his right on her.” (Tafsir)

Ibn Abbas stated in the tafsir of Yusuf 12/100: “And he placed his parents on the dais on an elevated platform and they fell down before him prostrate i.e. his parents and brothers fell prostrate before him. This prostration was a sign of greeting between them: the person of humble standing prostrated to the person of high standing, the youth to the elderly and the young to the old; it is a slight bowing as is known among non-Arabs” (Tanwir al-Miqbas min Tafsir Ibn Abbas)

It is stated in the tafsir of the same ayah in tafsir al-Jalalayn “And he raised his parents, he seated them next to him, upon the throne, and they fell down, that is, his parents and brothers, prostrating before him — a prostration that was [actually] a bowing down, not placing their foreheads down [on the ground]; this was their standard [form of] greeting at that time.” (Tafsir al-Jalalayn)

Ibn Kathir stated following while explaining the same ayah: “and they fell down before him prostrate.” Yusuf's parents and brothers prostrated before him, and they were eleven men... In the laws of these and previous Prophets, it was allowed for the people to prostrate before the men of authority, when they met them. This practice was allowed in the law of Adam (as) until the law of Isa (as) but was later prohibited in our law. Islam made prostration exclusively for Allah Alone, the Exalted and Most Honored. The implication of this statement was collected from Qatadah and other scholars. When Muadh bin Jabal visited the Sham area, he found them prostrating before their priests. When he returned (to Al-Madinah), he prostrated before RasulAllah , who asked him: “What is this, O Muadh?” Muadh said, “I saw that they prostrate before their priests. However, you, O RasulAllah, deserve more to be prostrated before.” RasulAllah said: “If I were to order anyone to prostrate before anyone else (among the creation), I would have ordered the wife to prostrate before her husband because of the enormity of his right on her.” Therefore, this practice was allowed in previous laws, as we stated.” (Tafsir)

The matter without ikhtilaf and debate which the majority of the ahl ilm defend is that the sajdah of Muadh (ra) was not a prostration of ibadaah yet it was only a prostration of honoring. The reason is because how could it be possible that the valuable sahabah does not know that the prostration of ibadaah is performed only to Allah? SubhanAllah this is great dhulm and slander to the sahabah. That sahabah which RasulAllah (saw) had chosen to debate with the ahl kitab and make dawah of tawhid and asluddeen among all the sahabah. RasulAllah (saw) had said to him: “...you will go to a people, consisting of Jews and Christians.” The comment Haifdh made in Fathu’l Bari regarding “...you will go to a people, consisting of Jews and Christians” he says: “This is to prepare someone to show all his effort for his recommendation. The reason is the ahl kitab generally had been ahl ‘ilm. For this reason talking to them would not be effort breaking as it would be with the idolworshipper ignorants.” (Fathu’l Bari, 3/419)

In other versions of the hadith it is stated that “Muadh (ra) traveled to Yemen or Shaam area. There he found the Christians prostrating themselves before their bishops and priests. He said to himself that RasulAllah (saw) has more right to be honored. When he returned he told RasulAllah (saw) of this and said I wanted to do the same for you; I thought that you have more right to be honored. RasulAllah (saw) replied: If I were to order anyone to do this then I would have ordered the woman to prostrate

herself before her husband. By Him, in Whose Hand is the soul of Muhammad, a woman will not fulfill the rights of her Lord completely until she fulfills the rights of her husband completely..." Abd ur-Rahman ibnu Abi Layla reports from his father about Muadh Ibnu Jabal that he found in Shaam area the Christians prostrating themselves..." So I asked Why do you do this? They explained to me that this was the way to greet the Prophets in the past. I said: "We have more right to do this with our Prophet." RasulAllah (saw) thus explained to me that they were keen to spread about lies concerning their prophets and manipulated their books. RasulAllah (saw) said: Allah has given us something better. He has given us the Salam, which is the greeting of the people of Paradise." (Ahmad)

As a result prostrating out of Reverence (Sujud al-Tadhim) to other than Allah is haraam. The prostration of reverence or greeting (tahiyya), for other than Allah, is unlawful. Prostration of worship for other than Allah is kufr and Prostration of Reverence for other than Allah is unlawful. The prostration of reverence for other than Allah has been agreed to be unlawful in the sharee'ah, and all works [of Sacred Law] affirm its unlawfulness. The prostration of reverence is not shirk, but it is unlawful and a great sin (kabira). Its unlawfulness is proved by decisively-transmitted (mutawatir) Prophetic hadith and decisive texts of Sacred Law.

2- This type of prostration was abolished for us with this incident

The practice of such prostration was allowed for previous nations but was abolished for us with this hadith of Muadh (ra).

Muadh (ra) had been to the Sham and had seen the people bowing out of respect to their bishops and their priests. Naturally, he figured, why not show this same type of respect to RasulAllah (saw). This prostration was thus not one of worship, but one of respect. This is the same for the parents of Yusuf (as), who along with his brothers prostrated to him out of respect. Some people said that this prostration was just a prostration of greeting, peace and honor, hence Allah's statement, 'And he (Prophet Yusuf) raised his parents to the throne and they fell down before him prostrate. And he said, 'O my father! This is the interpretation of my dream afore time! My Lord has made it come true!' (Yusuf 12/100) Dhahabi said: "Don't you see that those sahabah whose love is very much towards RasulAllah asked him: "shall we prostrate to you?" He said: "No." If he had given permission to them, they would have prostrated to him with the prostration of reverence and respect and not prostration of worship. Likewise his brothers prostrated to Yusuf (as)." (Mujamu's -Shuyuh al-Mujamu'l-Kabir 1/46)

Baghawi says, "This prostration was not one whereby the face was placed on the earth, rather it was merely bowing, and when Islam came then this (action of bowing to other than Allah) was invalidated." (Mualim at-Tanzeel 1/81)

Would RasulAllah (saw) have chosen an individual who is ignorant in the asl of tawhid from among his ashab someone to debate with the Christians and to dispute with them in a matter he has no knowledge of?

Surely Qurtubi in his tafsir proves with this hadith that the sujuud of salam had been permissible until the era of RasulAllah (saw).

In his tafsir of the following ayah Ibn Kathir stated "And behold, We said to the angels: 'Bow down to Adam'" (al-Baqarah 2/34): "Qatadah commented on Allah's statement, (And (remember) when We said to the angels: 'Prostrate yourselves before Adam.' The obedience was for Allah and the prostration was before Adam. Allah honored Adam and commanded the angels to prostrate before him. Some people said that this prostration was just a prostration of greeting, peace and honor, hence Allah's statement, (And he (Prophet Yusuf) raised his parents to the throne and they fell down before him prostrate. And he said: 'O my father! This is the interpretation of my dream aforetime! My Lord has made it come true!'" (Yusuf 12/100) The practice of prostrating was allowed for previous nations, but was repealed for ours. Muadh said to RasulAllah (saw) "I visited Ash-Sham and found that they used to prostrate before their priests and scholars. You, O RasulAllah, are more deserving of prostration." RasulAllah said: "No. If I was to command any human to prostrate before another human, I would command the wife to prostrate before her husband because of the enormity of his right on her." (Tafsir)

Likewise in his explanation of the ayah in surah Yusuf "And he raised his parents to the Arsh and they fell down before him prostrate"(Yusuf 12/100) he stated: "In the laws of these and previous Prophets, it was allowed for the people to prostrate before the men of authority, when they met them. This practice was allowed in the law of Adam (as) until the law of Isa (as) but was later prohibited in our law. Islam made prostration exclusively for Allah Alone, the Exalted and Most Honored. The implication of this statement was collected from Qatadah and other scholars. When Muadh bin Jabal visited the Sham area, he found them prostrating before their priests. When he returned (to Madina), he prostrated before the RasulAllah, who asked him "What is this, O, Muadh". Muadh said, "I saw that they prostrate before their priests. However, you, O RasulAllah, deserve more to be prostrated before." RasulAllah (saw) said: "If I were to order anyone to prostrate before anyone else (among the creation), I would have ordered the wife to prostrate before her husband because of the enormity of his right on her." Therefore, this practice was allowed in previous laws, as we stated." (Tafsir)

Shawkani stated after preferring this sujuud was regarding honouring Adam mentioned in the ayah "And behold, We said to the angels: 'Bow down to Adam'." (al-Baqarah 2/34) "Surely making sajdah to a creation within the frame of benefit had been permissible in some sharee'ah. Likewise this ayah shows sujuud being preformed for Adam. In reality this is also (seen) in other ayah "When I have fashioned him (in due proportion) and breathed into him of My spirit, fall ye down in obeisance unto him." (Sad 38/72) "And he raised his parents high on the throne (of dignity), and they fell down in prostration, (all) before him." (Yusuf 12/100) In the sharee'ah of our prophet this (sajdah) being haraam to that other than Allah does not necessitate it being like this also in other sharee'ah.

"This prostration of the angels before Adam was a sign of honor and respect and out of obedience to the command of Allah. Qatadah commented, 'The obedience was for Allah and the prostration was before Adam. Allah honored Adam and commanded the angels to prostrate before him'." (Tabari)

Ibn Taymiyyah states: "The Nafilah ibadaah are also performed only for Allah. It is not correct for it to be performed to the sun, the moon, a state leader, a prophet, a salih individual or the grave of a prophet or a salih individual. It is as such in the sharee'ah of all prophets. This has been mentioned in our sharee'ah. Such that deenul Islam has cautioned from exalting the creations and having high opinion of them. For this reason RasulAllah (saw) had restricted Muadh from making sujuud to him and said "if I were to order anyone that he should to other than Allah, I would have ordered that the wife prostrate to her husband." (Ibn Majah, Nikah; Ahmad ibn Hanbal, IV/381, VI/76, V/228) Again he had restricted the sahabah to bow while giving salam and restricted for them to stand up while he himself is seated in salah." (Fatawa, 1/74-75)

After Ibn Taymiyyah explained the ruling of sujud, ruku and qiyam due to showing respect (Fatawa: 1/257-260) he said: "Ruku and sujud was performed due to greeting in the sharee'ah other than ours. Likewise it is stated in the surah Yusuf: "And he raised his parents high on the throne (of dignity), and they fell down in prostration, (all) before him. He said: "O my father! this is the fulfilment of my vision of old!.." (Yusuf 12/100) In our sharee'ah it is not permissible to make sujud for other than Allah. Moreover, as it was mentioned above, standing for one another as Ajam is prohibited, how could ruku and sujud not be prohibited?" (Fatawa 1/260)

These statements of the ulama show that the mentioned prostration was the prostration of salam. This had been permissible in other sharee'ah until the sharee'ah of Islam. As known the sajdah of ibadaah to any other than Allah had never been permitted in any sharee'ah. On the contrary all the Nabi had cautioned from this and had made the following dawah to all the tribes "O my people! Worship Allah: ye have no other god but Him." (Araf 7/73)

The greatest evidence that the sajdah of Muadh had been the sajdah of salam is this statement of RasulAllah (saw) at the end of his hadith: "If I were to order anyone that he should to other than Allah, I would have ordered that the wife prostrate to her husband." Even this shows that the mentioned sajdah is a sajdah of salam and honoring or else it would have contradicted this ayah. (Wa a'udhu billah) "Nor would he instruct you to take angels and prophets for Lords and patrons. What! would he bid you to unbelief after ye have bowed your will (To Allah in Islam)?" (Al-i Imran 3/80)

Depending on the intention behind performing it, Sujud is either an act of worship, and in Islam, all acts of worship are strictly and exclusively directed at Allah. Both the angels and mankind are prohibited from making this type of Sujud to other than Allah. Or, Sujud is a matter of habit and tradition to honor kings and leaders, and as such, pertains to the Islamic Law which has prohibited it. In addition, if it were Prophet Yusuf whom made Sujud by his parents and if it were mankind whom Allah ordered to make Sujud to the angels, then this Sujud would still be allowed for them since it is not meant as an act of worship but as a way of greeting and honoring those who deserve to be honored. Or, Sujud, is done involuntarily, as clear from Allah's statement, "See you not that whoever is in the heavens and whoever is on the earth, and the sun, and the moon, and the stars, and the mountains, and the trees, and Ad Dawâbb [moving (living) creatures, beasts], and many of mankind prostrate themselves to Allâh. But there are many (men) on whom the punishment is justified (they do not worship Allah). And

whomsoever Allâh disgraces, none can honor him. Verily, Allâh does what He wills” (al-Hajj 22/18). Or, Sujud is in the context of Allah’s punishment to disbelieving nations as is clear from the Qur’anic Verses describing the fate of the tribes Ad and Thamud who were destroyed and left laying prostrate on their foreheads. And on the Day of Judgment, every nation shall fall to their knees to the Lord, prostrating before His Majesty and Irresistible Power. There is also the voluntary Sujud as an act of worship that mankind will be asked to perform on the Day of Resurrection; those who did not do it voluntarily and sincerely in this life will not be able to perform it voluntarily on the Day of Judgment, “(Remember, or mention) the Day when the Shin (of Allah) shall be laid bare (on the Day of Resurrection) and they shall be called to prostrate themselves (to Allâh), but they (hypocrites) shall not be able to do so. Their eyes will be cast down and ignominy will cover them; they used to be called to prostrate themselves (offer prayers), while they were healthy and good (in the life of the world, but they did not)” (al-Qalam 68/42-43)

Would they come to a conclusion that RasulAllah (saw) meant the worshipping while stating: “I would have ordered the wife to prostrate before her husband.” So their inference should be: “If I were to order anyone to worship someone other than Allah, then I would have ordered the woman to worship her husband?

RasulAllah (saw) did not say to Muadh, “Do not do this, because Sujud is an act of worship and directing any act of worship at other than Allah is Shirk.” He did not say, “It is alright to do it, because the angels worshipped Adam as the Qur’an stated.” He (saw) merely stated that this type of Sujud was prohibited in Islam and that if he were to allow it, he would have ordered the wife to prostrate to her husband. It is not possible that RasulAllah, who upheld Islamic Monotheism in its most clear and pure form, would say to his companion, “If I were to order anyone to worship anyone else besides Allah, I would have ordered the wife to worship her husband in Sujud,” because this would contradict the essence of Tawhid which the companions embraced in defiance of Shirk itself.

The usual of those who claim that sujud is only for worship take them to the extremes such as claiming that Yusuf (as) became and was content to be taghout by permitting his father and brothers to worship him, his father prophet Yaqub worshipped other than Allah, RasulAllah (saw) reacted very calm when Muadh worshipped him and Allah (swt) ordered the angels to associate partners to Him. Waiyadubillah.

All this explanation is enough to establish the misconception of the dalil presented. Fadhillah and minnah are only to Allah.

f- Clarification of the doubts about the Hatib (ra)'s incident

When Allah has deviated an individual there is no other to give him hidayah. An individual who has not comprehended the basis of Islam; which is tawhid, will undoubtedly have kufr in his life because he has not understood and grasp the essence of deen. Even if an individual has some knowledge of tawhid he will confuse haq and bateel and this confused state will make him like those ignorants who look at

beards as signs of Islam, be fooled and go astray. This action of falling off track and going astray is an action of kufr. However, 'ilm has a scale, a range and a method. The ignorant ones who claim to have the most sufficient and reasonable knowledge are namely the sheikhs. These sheiks have tried to prove their bateel aqidah; they have tried to use this bateel aqidah in their advancement by abandoning the way of the Salaf and extracting bid'ah. Regardless of the old scholars and imitating their own nafs, also by embracing difficult situations and using them as their excuse, they use the swamp of kufr they have fallen into as a stepping stone to prove their aqidah. With the usul they have developed, they have opened a new era and have almost left the modernists behind. It is awfully clear how these comrades of the shaytan get their revelations from the same place and perform ibadah to the same idol; shaytan. What a coincidence it is that the servants of shaytan meet at the same location!

Throughout history shaytan and his comrades have approached the passengers of this path from their rights. They have adorned bateel and have made the deviated sects {Callers of Haakimiyyah -al-Qudsiyya wa Taifatul Adawatulilhaq; Murji'ah of the time (mostly known as Saudi Salafis) Talafis and warriors of deliverance –the so called jihaadis-} (of today) go astray; just as the Sufis had gone astray. These individuals have betrayed haq in various manners by Arab racism or by idolizing their own fame, privilege and even the knowledge they have attained. Many youth who had the inclination towards Islam have come across these characters in this path of Islam and have been fooled by their embellished speech. They have been fooled by their bulky works filled with mixture of haq and bateel and never stopped to think of the shaytan who had fallen into denial before his Rabb.

When one tries to speak with one of these ignorant individuals and youth, they will find themselves to be belittled and they'll see that these individuals exalt their so-called scholar. Even though they are named differently, without knowing they are on the same path using the same method as the Sufis. These movement of the deviated sects mentioned above has become the modern day tasawwuf and like a tariqah. Their leaders have become the Sufi sheikhs and they have become the Sufi murid. The Muslims who have attained the subjective hidayah will notice the trick of the shaytan very quickly. The deficiency of the muqallid murids (such as the jihaadi wannabe youth); is their lack of knowledge before action. If they had attained knowledge they would not have lacked to realize the one thousand and one kufr and the bateel usul of their so-called scholars.

Imam al-Bukhari (ra) used a chapter titled as "Knowledge comes before statement and action." under the light of the verse: "Know, therefore, that there is no god but Allah" (Muhammad 47/19) in his Sahih. Then al-Hafidh Ibn Hajar (ra) commented upon this statement saying: "Ibn Muner stated; according to his statement "Knowledge comes before statement and action.": so knowledge is a condition for the correctness of the statement and action. So these two (statement and action) are not held in high esteem, except due to it (knowledge), so it must take precedence over them; since the correctness of the intention is a prerequisite for the correctness of action." (Fathu'l-Bari 1/160)

Hafidh Khatib al-Baghdadi (ra) said: "So knowledge is a tree, and actions are its fruit. The one who does not act upon his knowledge is not to be counted as being a scholar. And it is said, the knowledge is the father, and actions are its offspring. And action comes after knowledge, and narration comes after

investigation. So do not feel content with action, as long as you are deficient in knowledge.” (Iqtidaa’ul-’Ilmil-’Amal, 5-6)

On the contrary, we come across in an era which looks like the same scheme described in the ahadith:

Narrated by Abdullah bin Amr bin al-As that he said: “I heard RasulAllah (saw) saying, "Allah does not take away the knowledge, by taking it away from (the hearts of) the people, but takes it away by the death of the religious learned men until none of the (religious learned men) remains, people will take as their leaders ignorant persons when consulted who will give their verdict without knowledge. So they will go astray and will lead the people astray.” (Bukhari; Muslim)

Habeeb Ibn Ubayd (ra) said, “Learn knowledge and understand and be benefited by it. Do not learn it for beautifying yourselves by it. Then it may happen - if you live long - that a person beautifies himself with knowledge, just as a man beautifies himself with clothes.” (Khatib al-Baghdadi, Iqtidaa’ul-’Ilmil-’Amal #35)

Abu Umayyah al-Jumhee narrated that RasulAllah (saw) said: “Indeed, three things are from the signs of the hour: One of them is that knowledge is taken from the Asaaghir.” Nu’aaym (one who is in the chain of narration of this hadith who narrated by way of Ibn Mubarak) said: “Ibn Mubarak was asked: Who are the Asaaghir?” He answered: “Those who speak with their opinions, but as for a Sagheer (young person) who narrates upon a kabeer (elder person), then this is not what is meant by “Asaaghir”.” Abdullah ibn Mas’ud (ra) said “The people will continue to be upon good so long as they take knowledge from their Akaabir, but if they take it from their Asaaghir they will be destroyed.” (Yusuf ibn Abdil-Barr, Jaami’ Bayaan al-’Ilm wa Fadlihi, 216)

Ibn Mas’ud (ra) said: “You are in a time whose scholars are many, and its speakers are few. After you will come a time whose scholars are few, and whose speakers are many.” (Tabarani, al-Kabeer # 8066; Bukhari, al-Adabul-Mufrad # 789; Ibn Hajar, Fathu’l-Bari 10/1510)

May Allah, increase us in knowledge and benefit us with practicing. May Allah keep our eyes and hearts awake against the asaaghir! Ameen!

There are three doubts/claims which took place regarding the hukm of the incident of Hatib (ra).

The first doubt is that which: he assisted the kuffar of Mecca, however, along with that; RasulAllah (saw) did not declare him a kafir so this proves that Mudhaharah (assisting and helping) to the kuffar is not kufr!

Those who assert this claim utilize the situation Hatib (ra) had fallen into and ignore the fact that he had only sinned (took action of haraam) and equate his given hukm with those who become spies against Islam and help the kuffar against Muslims. A short refutation will take place in the following regarding this doubt insha’Allah. Refutations of this doubt and claims do take place in many books of the scholars

of Islam. Regarding this matter within the contemporary books (although there is many kufr in these works) "At-tibyan fi kufri man aanil amrikan" and "hukmu ianatil kuffar alal muslimin", it has been described in detail and this bateel opinion has been refuted.

The second doubt concerning this issue has been brought out by the Qudsiyya. Shaykh Dr Sayfuddeen Al-Muwahhid in his work "hukmu ianatil kuffar alal muslimin" tries to prove that it is kufr to become a spy against Islam and to help the kuffar against the Muslims. He ignores the situations in which the action of helping the kuffar against the Muslim and becoming a spy for them becomes haraam.

The third doubt in the incident of Hatib (ra) is the view of, Abu Baseer at-Tartousi, AbdulQadir AbdulAziz and Nasir al-Fahd and their likes; the so called jihaadis. This third doubt and claim is that helping the kuffar against the Muslim is kufr however as in the incident of Hatib b. Abi Balte'a some excuses are a barrier for takfir. Hatib b. Abi Balte'a had performed an action of kufr however due to his excuse he was not given the hukm kafir. This doubt is actually a slander to the sahabah; stating the performance of the action of kufr and it is also slandering RasulAllah (saw); with the acceptance of this kufr and not giving the hukm of kafir. They build their doubt on the answer of RasulAllah (saw) to Umar (ra): "Who knows, perhaps Allah has looked at the warriors of Badr and said (to them), 'Do whatever you like, for I have forgiven you.'" As seen, this third doubt and claim, which is the claim of the warriors of deliverance, is much dangerous than the first two doubts. This is because; this claim also contains a slander to the Allah (awj). Although Allah (awj) stated He would not forgive shirk, they support the idea "Hatib (ra) performed kufr, but Allah (awj) forgave him anyway, because of his being a warrior of Badr", be sure Allah (awj) never breaks His (awj) ahd (promise):

Allah (swt) states: "Allah forgiveth not that partners should be set up with Him; but He forgiveth anything else, to whom He pleaseth; to set up partners with Allah is to devise a sin most heinous indeed." (an-Nisa 4/48)

After Imam Abu Butayn related the following from Shaikhu'l-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah "whoever performs the action of shirk with no doubt is mushrik. He will be invited to repent. If he has repented it is great, if not he will be killed" he said: "With no doubt Imam Ibn Taymiyyah in many places has clarified that an individual who performs any action of shirk will be given the hukm of takfir. Although he had transported from the ijma of the Muslim he had not distinguished the ignorant etc. Allah stated "Allah forgiveth not (The sin of) joining other gods with Him; but He forgiveth whom He pleaseth other sins than this: one who joins other gods with Allah, Hath strayed far, far away (from the right)." (an-Nisa 4/116)

Allah also with the expression of Masih states: "...Whoever joins other gods with Allah, Allah will forbid him the garden, and the Fire will be his abode. There will for the wrong-doers be no one to help." (al-Maida 5/72)

Now whoever claims this avoidance to be particular to only muannid (the stubborn) individuals and excludes the ignorant, the misinterpreter and muqallid (the imitators) with no doubt will have opposed Allah (swt) and RasulAllah (saw) and he will have separated from the path of the Muminoon. Moreover

in the books of the fuqaha, the section of 'the hukm of the murtad' commences with the following: "Whoever performs the action of shirk to Allah... and they never limit it with the muannid. In reality this is an open matter. Alhamdulillah." (al Intisar li Hizb' il Muwahhidun war'Rad ala'l Mujadil an'il-Mushrikeen, 27; Aqidat ul-Muwahhideen wa'r-red ala'd-Dullul wal Mubtedeen)

Hatib had never performed an action of kufr; on the contrary, he had performed an action which is haraam. It is openly kufr to help the kuffar against the Muslim without an acceptable excuse however the action Hatib took is not included in this class. The reason for this is because after his action it had been clarified that he was not helping the kuffar against the Muslim yet he was condemned. We learn from RasulAllah (saw) that although he had performed an action of haraam he had been forgiven because he had attended Badr. This means the claim of the warriors of deliverance that Hatib had performed an action of kufr but was forgiven due to his attendance in Badr is incorrect. Because an individual who performs the action of shirk or kufr is not forgiven unless he turns and repents with pure intentions. The results of the performance of the action of shirk or kufr does not change regardless of being an attendant of Badr or not. This issue also will be explained in detail below insha'Allah.

Now we will include the narrations given in the books of hadith and the interpretations from the books of tafsir and conclude with the evidence of how empty the assertions of the deviated groups mentioned before, really are.

RasulAllah (saw) asked the Muslims to start making preparations for an expedition but at the same time also ordered them to keep it a secret. Later on, the Apostle informed the men who intended to go to Mecca and ordered them to get ready for it. He also prayed, "O Allah, confound the spies and the informers of the Quraish so that we may take them by surprise in their land." (Zad al-Ma'ad, 1/421; Ibn Hisham, 2/397) When RasulAllah (saw) informed his companions about his intention to attack Mecca, they quietly started making preparations for it. Hatib b. Abi Balta'a wrote a letter to the Quraish about the intended attack and gave it to a woman for its delivery to Quraish. Hatib also promised to give some monetary reward to the woman who left for Mecca after putting the letter on her head and folding her hair over it. A voice from heaven informed the Apostle about the action of Hatib. He immediately sent forth Ali (ra) and Zubair (ra) in pursuit of the woman. They went off racing against each other on their horses until they reached the designated meadow. There they found the woman mounted on her camel. Then she drew out the letter from her tresses and handed it over to them. The letter, which was handed to RasulAllah, had been written by Hatib informing the Quraish about the departure of the Muslim army. Hatib said, "O RasulAllah, I had been consigned as an ally to the Quraish and was not one of them. It is because Hatib belonged to the tribe of Lakhm settled in northern Hijaz and Syria. It is related by some that he was a confederate of Bani Asad b. Abdulul-Uzza in Mecca; others hold him to be under the protection of Zubayr; there are still others who say that he was a freedman of Abdallah b. Hamid al-Asadi. (al-Isabah fi Tamiz is-Sahabah, Vol. p. 300) He then explained his situation and said that other emigrants with RasulAllah have their relations among the Quraish who will take care of their families. He said he thought that as he did not have that advantage, he should give them some help so that they might protect his relatives. Hatib only wanted prestige and respect with Quraysh since he had no relatives in Mecca. RasulAllah (saw) then said Hatib has told the truth and added Hatib was among those

who witnessed the Battle of Badr as a warrior and perhaps Allah looked upon the people of Badr and said Do what you want as I have forgiven you.

Bukhari, Muslim, Ahmad, Abu Dawud, Tirmidhi, Nasai, Ibn Jarir Tabari, Ibn Hisham, Ibn Hibban, Ibn Abi Hatim, Ibnu'l-Athir in Usdu'l-Ghabaa and Wahidi in his Asbab al-Nuzul and others have related this incident on the authority of several reliable transmitters. The most authentic of these narrations is the tradition which Ali (ra)'s secretary, Ubaidullah bin Abu Rafi, heard from Ali (ra) himself, and from him Hasan bin Muhammad bin Hanafiyah (ra), heard and conveyed to the later reporters. In different traditions from different narrators using different wordings; the incident has been reported but the claim of all is one and the same. The commentators are in agreement, and Ibn Abbas, Mujahid, Qatadah, Urwah bin Zubair and others also have unanimously reported, that Mumtahina 1 (or the first part of Mumtahina or the whole surah) were revealed at the time Hatib bin Abi Balte'a's incident occurred. More detailed information in the tafsir books can be found inshaAllah.

Narrated by Ubaidullah bin Abi Rafi who said: "I heard Ali saying, "RasulAllah sent me, az-Zubair and al-Miqdad somewhere saying, 'Proceed till you reach Rawdat Khakh. There you will find a lady with a letter. Take the letter from her.' "So, we set out and our horses ran at full pace till we got at ar-Rawda where we found the lady and said (to her). "Take out the letter." She replied, "I have no letter with me." We said, "Either you take out the letter or else we will take off your clothes." So, she took it out of her braid. We brought the letter to RasulAllah and it contained a statement from Hatib bin Abi Balte'a to some of the Meccan pagans informing them of some of the intentions of RasulAllah. Then RasulAllah said, "O Hatib! What is this?" Hatib replied, "O RasulAllah! Don't hasten to give your judgment about me. I was a man closely connected with the Quraish, but I did not belong to this tribe, while the other emigrants with you, had their relatives in Mecca who would protect their dependents and property. So, I wanted to recompense for my lacking blood relation to them by doing them a favor so that they might protect my dependents. I did this neither because of disbelief nor apostasy nor out of preferring kufr to Islam." RasulAllah said, "Hatib has told you the truth." Umar said, O RasulAllah! Allow me to chop off the head of this hypocrite." RasulAllah said, "Hatib participated in the battle of Badr, and who knows, perhaps Allah has already looked at the Badr warriors and said, 'Do whatever you like, for I have forgiven you.'" (Bukhari)

Ibn Taymiyyah said: "The scholars have agreed on the authenticity of this story which is mutawatir and well known by the scholars of tafsir, the scholar of hadith, the scholars of the science of the historic military expeditions, the scholars of sirah, the scholars of history and the scholars of fiqh and others." (al-Minhaj 4/331)

The incident of Hatib bin Abi Balte'a can be analyzed from various views:

1- Assisting and aiding the kuffar against the Muslim is kufr

1- The incident of Hatib (ra) is one of the greatest evidences in relation to the kufr of assisting and helping the kuffar against the Muslim (Mudhahara) and the apostasy from Islam. This is shown clearly in

three points in the Hadith narrated about this incident:

a) Without hesitation Umar (ra) made takfir of Hatib directly.

The statement of Umar (ra) in this Hadith: "Leave me to strike the neck of this Munafiq (hypocrite)." And in another narration (it is reported that he stated): "Certainly he has disbelieved." And in another narration, after RasulAllah (saw) said: "Did he not witness Badr?" Umar replied: "Yes, however he has gone back and helped your enemies against you."

The statements of Umar (ra) about Hatib (ra) provides us with evidence to how clear and sound Umar and the other Companions had established that, Mudhaharah (helping and assisting) to the Kuffar is kufr and in such case becoming murtad (abjuration) from Islam was inevitable. Umar had uttered such words because his understanding of what he had seen, within the actions of Hatib in this incident, was kufr and irtidad (abjuration). The statement of Umar was not because he had acted without thinking. It was only because Umar only saw the peripheral of Hatib's action and not the real intention of Hatib.

b) No one had critized Umar's (ra) judgement and takfir

The implied approval of RasulAllah (saw) and others who had been present and involved in the judgment, for the understanding Umar (ra) had; was that Umar had not been censured for his hukm of Takfir on Hatib (ra) rather, RasulAllah (saw) mentioned that Hatib had an acceptable excuse for his action. Umar had passed judgement from what he had seen as the action of Hatib (ra) without questioning and learning the real reason of the action of Hatib (ra). As Umar passed judgment none of the Companions nor did RasulAllah (saw) silence Umar for his judgement. If Umar had been mistaken with what he had seen on the exterior; he would have been silenced or corrected. But this did not take place which proves that the help and assistance of a Muslim to the kuffar is kufr. RasulAllah (saw) however did stop to question his Companion Hatib (ra) before passing any judgement over him. Hence the incident of Hatib was a special condition and that his intention was not to harm the Muslim but only was it to protect his family; the ruling over him was that he had not performed an action of kufr because of the real intention of his action, but rather he had performed an action of haraam.

c) The manner Hatib (ra) used in defence

Hatib (ra) had defended himself by saying: "I did not do that out of Kufr nor out of apostasy from my deen or out of pleasure with Kufr after Islam." This statement is proof that Hatib (ra) did understand that Mudhaharah of the kuffar is kufr, so he made sure to mention the reality of his action before any judgement could be passed of him.

In the narration of Abi Ya'la and Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Hatib stated the following: "I did not take this action to fool RasulAllah (saw) or due to nifaq. Furthermore I had the belief Allah (jj) will make RasulAllah (saw) victorious and complete his divine radiance." In another narration Hatib (ra) stated: "O RasulAllah (saw) by Allah the iman in my heart never changed." (Majma al-Zawaid 9/306) These narrations show that

Hatib (ra) carried the belief that; helping and supporting the kuffar against the Muslim is kufr and irtidad. And that this action would mean showing consent to kufr and it would be nifaq and deceit to RasulAllah (saw). For this reason he wanted to explain the reality of his situation and his niyyah to RasulAllah (saw).

Shaikh Hamad Ibn Atiq said: "Verily the help to the mushrikeen and pointing out the vulnerabilities of the Muslim, or defending them with the tongues or being pleased with what they are upon; all of these are things which cause one to disbelieve. And those whom these actions come from; if they are not from any of the aforementioned compulsion, then they are apostates, even if while doing so they hate kuffar and love the Muslims." (ad-Difa an ahl-sunnah wa'l-ittiba, 32)

For more information on Mudhahara is being kufr and apostasy from Islam ["The Ruling on helping the kuffar against the Muslims"](#)

2- The act of becoming a spy against the Muslim which is not kufr

2- It is the right of an individual to look for/expect detailed explanations regarding the issue of being a spy against the Muslim in a written book on the subject of the ruling on helping the kuffar against the Muslim. In his work Sayfuddeen al-Muwahhid had established the proofs for the conditions of kufr regarding this matter however failed to mention anything about the conditions of haraam in this matter.

Scholars recorded the following regarding the act of becoming a spy against the Muslim which is not kufr. In his tafsir while explaining the incident of Hatib (ra), Qurtubi states the following: "If an individual knows the confidential lives of the Muslim well and attracts attention to it, if he notifies their enemy of their state; and if he is doing this for worldly purposes and if his itikad is strong he will not become kafir with this action... If we accept that an individual in this state does not become kafir, as a punishment of hadd; will he be killed or not? Regarding this matter scholars have had conflict of opinion." (Tafsir al-Qurtubi; 18/46) After stating such he continues to state the views of the scholars regarding the punishment of hadd. Ibni Kathir in his tafsir had stated: "Let not the believers take the disbelievers as protecting friends instead of the believers, and whoever does that will never be helped by Allah in any way, except if you indeed fear a danger from them. And Allah warns you against Himself (His punishment)." (al-i Imran 3/28) This is why RasulAllah accepted the excuse of Hatib (ra) when he said that he only wanted to have a favour on the Quraysh, because of the property and family members he had left behind in Mecca." For this reason Allah (swt) had warned Hatib (ra): "Of no profit to you will be your relatives and your children on the Day of Judgment: He will judge between you: for Allah sees well all that ye do." (al-Mumtahina 60/3)." (Tafsir Ibn Kathir)

Imam Shafii was asked: "Do you view that the Muslim who writes to enemy mushrik fighters informing them the Muslims are about to attack them or informs about the secret plans of the Muslims as being one whose blood is permissible (to execution) as this indicates his allegiance to the mushrik? Imam Shafii replied: Whoever Islam is confirmed from is not permissible to execute except if he murders or commits adultery after protecting himself or clearly disbelieves after iman and then his kufr is

confirmed. Informing of the secret plans of the Muslims and warning kuffar by informing that Muslims want to attack is not clear kufr. Then it was said to Imam Shafii: Do you say this based on the text or out of analogy? Imam Shafii said: I say it because I have no knowledge of the Muslim in question that he goes against the clear sunnah after the Book, has been made clear to him. Then it was said to Imam Shafii: Mention what the sunnah says about it? Then Imam Shafii brought the narration of Hatib and said: Within this hadith along with what we described earlier is the ruling of the use of doubtful matters because when the letter has the meaning that Hatib said as he said it, i.e. that he did not do it doubting Islam, rather he did it out of saving his family and it could also be a slip (not an intention to hurt Islam) and the meaning could even be uglier than this, his word could mean his actual action. The ruling of RasulAllah (saw) was that he not be executed or punished and nobody came with the likes of this and what is most probable no one approached him in this way because RasulAllah (saw) made clear his great stature to all humanity after him. Because he was an informer to the mushrikeen when the messenger ordered an attack on them and they believed him from what is preponderant as can be seen in they did. For that reason anyone that came after him would also be accepted even if he was less in status and less important." (Kitab al-Umm, 4/249-250)

Imam Nawawi says, the hadith of Hatib (ra) is a proof that those who commit the kabair sins such as spying, do not become kafir. And ash-Shafi'i, Awzai, Maliki scholars and the jumhur (majority) said that killing the spy is not allowed. (Sharh Sahih Muslim, 12/67; Sharh Sahih Muslim, 16/55) Ibn Hajr says, in this hadith there is a rejection on those who make takfir on a Muslim due to sins such as spying. He also mentions that Imam Tahawi narrated ijma (consensus) that the life of a Muslim spy is protected." (Fathu'l-Bari, 12/310) Badrudeen Ayni says, this shows that a spy does not lose his iman due to his spying for the kuffar. (Umdat al-Qari, 22/47) al-Sarkhasi says that a Muslim does not lose his iman due to spying for the enemies. (Sharh Siyar al-Kabir, 1/214-215)

Details of this matter can be found in the books of fiqh.

i- Hatib (ra) did not perform kufr but haraam

3- In ayah 1 of Surat al-Mumtahina the statement of Allah (awj): "O ye who believe!" referring to Hatib provides us with evidence that Hatib (ra) had not performed the action of kufr. From this narration on the authority of Ibn Abbas he said concerning the interpretation of Allah's statement: "O ye who believe! Referring to Hatib," (Tanwir al-Miqbas min Tafsir Ibn Abbas) It has also been narrated that when Hatib heard himself being referred to as 'O ye who believe' he had fainted out of joy. In Imam Qurtubi's al Jamiu li Ahkamii'l Qur'an it has been narrated and shown to us that his heart was filled with iman and did not have the intention to betray Allah (swt) or his Prophet (saw). Also this action not being evaluated as kufr, the acceptance of his excuse and the joy of Hatib (ra) after being referred to as "O ye who believe" in the ayah shows that Hatib (ra) had understood the importance of the matter and that he had been afraid he would be given the hukm kafir.

4- Hatib (ra) had helped RasulAllah (saw) against his enemies; he had provided help with his tongue, wealth, physically, and mentally in all of the battles. He had attended Badr and Hudaibiyyah with

RasulAllah (saw). It is most certain that his place and those like him is the promised Jannah. He had also assisted RasulAllah (saw) in the conquest of Mecca. He had gone there with his wealth and life to fight against the Mushrikun. He never gave success to the kuffar over the Muslim. When he wrote that letter to the Mushrikun informing them of the action RasulAllah (saw) was to take, his intention was not to assist and help the Mushrikun over the Muslim. He himself was to fight against them with RasulAllah (saw) and he was already confident of the victory of the Muslim. After Umar accused him of nifaq and RasulAllah (saw) asked him about his action; he negated kufr and apostasy and parts of the Qur'an had been revealed: "O ye who believe! Take not my enemies and yours as friends (or protectors),- offering them (your) love, even though they have rejected the Truth that has come to you, and have (on the contrary) driven out the Prophet and yourselves (from your homes), (simply) because ye believe in Allah your Lord! If ye have come out to strive in My Way and to seek My Good Pleasure, (take them not as friends), holding secret converse of love (and friendship) with them: for I know full well all that ye conceal and all that ye reveal. And any of you that does this has strayed from the Straight Path." (al-Mumtahina)

This is among the most tremendous of evidences that the one who helps the kuffar with his life, wealth, tongue, or opinion and its likes do apostate from the Deen of Islam and Allah's refuge is sought.

5- The letter Hatib (ra) had sent to the Mushrik of Mecca does not account as help and support to the kuffar. It has been narrated by some scholars, in al-Fath that the letter was as follows: "O assembly of Quraysh. RasulAllah (saw) is approaching you with an army like the night that marches like the torrent and by Allah! If he was to come to you all alone, Allah would most certainly give him victory and fulfill for him His promise, so look after yourselves and Salam." (Al-Fath 7/520; Tafsir of Yahya b. Salam, Suhayli; Alusi, Ruh'ul-Maani; Qurtubi, Tafsir)

As seen in the content of this letter there is nothing which opposes iman. On the contrary there is evidence of a very strong and perfectly correct iman. However the greatest drawback is that he had tried to inform the enemy in secret, the secrets of the Muslim and the aim of war against them. It can never be understood that Hatib (ra) had tried to help and support the kuffar against the Muslim. However Hatib (ra) had disobeyed RasulAllah (saw) and had greatly sinned due to his action. His attendance in Badr and the good actions he had taken in the past had erased this sin.

6- Hatib had only done what he did out of a faulty interpretation (ta'wil) believing his letter would not harm the Muslim and that Allah would give victory His Deen and Prophet even if the Mushrikun had been aware of their coming. In the narrations of the hadith Hatib, had stated excusing himself: "I knew that Allah would assist His Messenger and complete for him his affair." And Hatib said: "And I knew that this would not have any harm upon you o RasulAllah" (Majmua Fatawa 5/68) Bukhari (ra) had narrated the story of Hatib in the section: "Seeking the repentance of the apostates and rebellious ones and fighting them." As well as in the section: "What has been narrated about those who make faulty interpretations." Hafidh Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, in al-Fath stated: "And the excuse of Hatib is what he himself mentioned for he did that out of faulty interpretation (ta'wil) thinking that there is no harm in it" (Fathu'l-Bari 8/634).

Consequently, there is a vast distinction between the actions of Hatib; being certain that the kuffar would not benefit from his letter in their war with RasulAllah (saw) and the one who would give them victory and assist them with what they would benefit from in their war against Islam and the Muslim.

Shaikh Abdullatif bin Abdurrahman bin Hasan said: “Hatib is included among those who are addressed in the name of iman and described as having iman and he had a special reason which indicated what he wanted and in the noble verses of the Qur’an is that which could include the action of Hatib as being a type of allegiance to the kuffar and the most evident indication of his love for them. If he did it due to the reasons (of loving them) then he would have strayed from the right path of guidance. However due to his (saw) statement ‘you have spoken the truth’ this indicates that he did not disbelieve for as long as he still believed in Allah and His Messenger without doubt. He only done that due to a worldly aim and if he disbelieved after it had been said: ‘free their way’ RasulAllah would have to said to Umar ‘And what do you know, Allah might have looked at them (warriors of Badr) and said (to them): Do what you like, for I have forgiven you’, this would not prevent from making takfir of him, as we say if he disbelieved what remained of his good actions it would not save him from falling into kufr and its rulings. As kufr destroys what came before it as Allah says: ‘if any one rejects faith, fruitless is his work’ (al-Maida 5/5) ‘If they were to join other gods with Him, all that they did would be vain for them’ (al-Anam 6/88) Kufr destroys ones good actions and ones iman this is agreed by consensus. As for Allahs saying: ‘And he amongst you that turns to them (for friendship) is of them.’ (al-Maida 5/51) And Allahs saying: ‘Thou wilt not find any people who believe in Allah and the Last Day, loving those who resist Allah and His Messenger, even though they were their fathers or their sons, or their brothers, or their kindred...’ (al-Mujadila 58/22) ‘O ye who believe! take not for friends and protectors those who take your religion for a mockery or sport,- whether among those who received the Scripture before you, or among those who reject Faith; but fear ye Allah, if ye have faith (indeed).’ (al-Maida 5/57) The sunnah explains this and particularizes this as being absolute and general allegiance. The basis of allegiance is love, supporting them and having close friendship with them and numerous other characteristics and every sin has its portion of censure and threat this issue is well known about amongst those firmly grounded in knowledge from the salaf, the companions and the successors.” (ar-Rasail wa’l-Masail an-Najdiyyah 3/9-10; ad-Durar as-Suniyyah 1/474) **ii- The Status of the Warriors of Badr**

7- The prophet (saw) said to ‘Umar (ra), “Who knows, perhaps Allah has looked at the warriors of the Badr and said (to them) ‘Do whatever you like, I have forgiven you.’” Many people from past and of today have misinterpreted this hadith and some said everything has been allowed for them; some others claimed that even if they perform kufr/shirk they would be forgiven. We will quote a portion from Ibn Qayyim which will provide us the correct understanding of the salaf regarding this matter. In his work al-Fawa'id, under the subtitle “The Status of the People of Badr” Ibn Qayyim (ra) says the following:

“Many people have misinterpreted this hadith, for the obvious meaning is that everything has been allowed for them and that they can do whatever they want. But, this in fact is not the case.

According to a group of people, among whom is Ibn al-Jawzy, “By this statement it does not mean that their future sins are included, but what are meant are the past sins. That is to say, “I have forgiven every bad thing you did before.” He (Ibn al-Jawzy) said “and there are two things that prove that: If it was supposed to mean future sins, the answer would have been: I will forgive you. The second thing is that it would have been a sort of freedom to commit sins, and there is no reason for that. The true meaning of this response is: I have forgiven your previous sins because of this battle. But it is a weak argument in two ways: Firstly, because the statement, ‘Do whatever you like, I have forgiven you.’ And the statement ‘I have forgiven you.’ Does not necessarily mean ‘I will forgive you’ in order to include future sins, for the statement ‘I have forgiven’ is a confirmation that there will be forgiveness in the future, just like the following statements in the Qur’an which means: “The qiyama (event) ordained by Allah will come to pass” and that which means “and your Lord comes” and so on. Secondly: the hadith itself replies to him, for the cause of it is the story of Hatib (ra) and his spying on the prophet (saw), and that is a sin that was committed after (6 years of) the battle of Badr and not before it, therefore, the second opinion is definitely correct. Allah knows best, but we think that this is a statement about people that Allah knew would not leave their religion, and that they would die in the state of Islam. He also knew that they might commit some sins like other people do, but He would not leave them to persist in them, but would make it easy for them to turn to Him with sincere repentance, seek His forgiveness and do righteous deeds that wipe out the trace of their sins. And this would be specified for them only and not for others. This is because their truthfulness has been proven and so they have been forgiven. It can also be that they were granted forgiveness because of these reasons, and it does not mean that they should stop performing religious duties, because of having been forgiven, and if that happened without fulfilling orders, they would not have needed to pray or fast or perform pilgrimage or pay zakat or do Jihaad. Just because someone is certain to be forgiven, it does not mean that repentance should be delayed. This point is mentioned in another hadith. Abu Hurayrah (ra) narrated that: “I heard the prophet (saw) saying, If somebody commits a sin and then says; O my Lord! I’ve sinned, please forgive me! And his Lord says, My slave knows that he has a Lord who forgives sins and punishes for it, I therefore have forgiven My slave (his sins). Then he remains without committing any sin for a while and then again commits another sin and says, O my Lord, I’ve committed another sin, please forgive me, and Allah says, My slave knows that he has a Lord who forgives sins and punishes for it, I therefore have forgiven My slave (his sin). Then he remains without committing any sin for a while and then commits another sin (for the third time) and says, O my Lord, I have committed another sin, please forgive me, and Allah says, My slave knows that he has a Lord who forgives sins and punishes for it, I therefore have forgiven My slave (his sins), he can do whatever he likes.” (Bukhari and Muslim) This does not mean that this person is allowed to do forbidden things, but it means that as long as the person repents, whenever he commits sins, Allah will forgive him. And the reason this servant has been distinguished with this is because it is known that he does not insist on a sin, and that whenever he commits a sin he repents. It is just as certain for this servant as it is for the people of Badr, as well as anyone RasulAllah (saw) gave

the good news of entering Paradise or told him that his sins had been forgiven. It was not understood from him or any of the companions that the person is free to commit sins and neglect religious duties. In fact these people were even more busy in exerting more effort and feared more after they received the good news than before. This applies more to the ten people who were given the good news of entering Paradise. Abu Bakr (ra), for instance was known to be even more cautious and he feared Allah a great deal. Likewise, Umar (ra) believed that this good news limited by its conditions, and so remained constant in piety until his death. Obviously, Umar (ra) continued to avoid anything that was forbidden. None of them understood that they were given absolute permission to do whatever they wanted.”

Ibn Hajar said the following under the chapter ‘The virtue of those who participated at Badr’: “And they agreed that the aforementioned glad tidings concern the rulings in akhriah not in the rulings of dunya, such as the establishment of hudud (the specified penalties) and other things.” (Fathu’l-Bari, 7/306)

Ibn Hajar quoted the following from Qurtubi while giving the explanations of surah al-Mumtahina: “This sentence also includes the meaning that they have a condition which brings them to a state of being worthy of being forgiven for the sins they will commit in the future and that which has become a cause for their sins of the past to be forgiven.” (Fathu’l-Bari, 10/67)

Ibn Taymiyyah said: “If RasulAllah is to accept the words of Allah ‘do as you please as I have forgiven you’ which he (saw) informs us of regarding those who have attended Badr and likes that these words are regarding minor sins or along with tawba it is regarding magfirah then there will be no difference between them and others. It is not possible that hadith is explained as all sins will be forgiven including kufr. The reason is because it is known that kufr is only forgiven with tawba. In the same sense the sins that are forgiven by cautioning from major sins and it being accepted only by them is also possible.” (Iman al-awsat 7/490)

Ibn Qayyim also mentioned this incident while he was explaining “Some of the wisdoms of Conquering Mecca” in the second volume of Zaad al-Ma’ad and said: “The killing of a spy is permitted –even if the spy is Muslim-. Hence, Umar (ra) had asked permission from RasulAllah (saw) to kill Hatib b. Abi Beltea because he had sent a letter informing those in Mecca of their status. However RasulAllah (saw) did not state: It would not be halaal to kill him, because he is Muslim, on the contrary he stated: “How do you know, maybe Allah had recognized those who were in Badr and said “Do as you please!”. By making this statement he had given Umar (ra) an answer by giving the reason behind not killing Hatib; the reason being he had been present in Badr. This answer is like an admonition to kill those who do not have any sort of prevention as such. This is one of the two views of Imam Malik and Ahmad b. Hanbal. Imam Shaafee and Abu Hanifa (also Ahmad b. Hanbal in dhahir view), state he can not be killed. Both groups bring evidence from the incident of Hatib. The truth is the decision of killing such individual is left to

the leader (power of authority). If they find it is beneficial for him to die they will kill him, but if they believe it is beneficial for him to live they will let him live. Allah knows best. If an individual is to make takfir of another not for his own enjoyment or hawa but he makes takfir and accuses one to be a munafiq due to being angered for the sake of Allah, RasulAllah and deen he will not have fallen into kufr for this reason he will not even be accounted for having sinned. He even will gain rewards for his purpose and niyyah. However this situation is to the contrary of those who follow their own nafs and those of ahl bid'ah. Hence they claim to accuse of being ahl bid'ah and make takfir for the purpose of their own nafs and the opposition of their madhhab. However they themselves are much deserving to this title than the individual they make accusation of. Great rewards which destruct sins can be penance for great sins except shirk. Just like his presence in Badri had been penance for Hatib for what he had done. For, the benefit this good deed comprises is the love Allah had of him, which Allah had complied with him, He had rejoiced with him and exalted those who did such act to the angels. All of these are much greater than the bad the crime of being a spy and that which it contains such as the animosity Allah. Consequently, the stronger defeated the weak, lifted it and cancelled what it had brought. No matter how great the sin, so long as it is not Shirk, the blessings of some other great deed may wipe it away. This is what happened with Hatib whose crime of espionage was forgiven because of his earlier service at Badr, since he had earned the Love of Allah and His Pleasure by his action at Badr. Allah was so pleased with and proud of them that, even a crime like espionage would not diminish this and shielded them from the anger of Allah; so the greater merit had overcome the lesser sin. This is a part of Divine Wisdom, He determines what is wholesome and what is not, He decrees reward and punishment, He makes the pure heart and the stricken one. And He said, "Surely good deeds wipe out evil ones" (Hud 114) And Allah also said: "If you avoid the evil deeds that have been forbidden to you We will forgive you your transgressions" (an-Nisa 4/31) When Aisha (raa) saw Zaid b. Arkam selling using the method of bayyinah her following statement is evidence for this: "Zaid had nullified the Jihaad he had been in attendance with RasulAllah (saw)." In the riwaya from RasulAllah (saw) in Sahih Bukhari states "Other than this there are ayah and hadith which state I have made the good and the bad distant from one another, one has nullified the other, the stronger one eliminating the weaker. Balancing and the miscarriage will be built upon this. In summary the strength of doing good deeds and the strength of revolting, attack and make war with one another. Along with this strength there remains a status of bickering with increase and destruction, with the status of regression and lacking (this is the best state of the ill) and jogtrot until one defeats the other. When the time of buhran comes the heart will gain one of the two, either salvation or destruction... This buhran will take place while the actions of being forgiven by Allah (awj) or making Allah (awj) angry and making Him punish, are taken. Thus in the dua of the Prophet we come across the following: "I request that which requires Your Mercy". That day for Talhaa (ra) He said "Talhaa had done things to deserve Jannah" and a man said to RasulAllah (saw): "O RasulAllah! He did something to deserve Jahannam." Upon this RasulAllah said "Free a slave in his name!" In a sahih hadith the following is stated: "Do you know what entails jannah and jahannam? They answered:

“Allah and his Rasul know best.” He replied: “An individual who dies without committing shirk will enter jannah; an individual who dies committing any type of shirk will enter jahannam.” With this hadith RasulAllah (saw) had wanted to make clear that tawhid and shirk are the base of jannah and jahannam and that these two are definitely either poison or the antidote. “Perhaps we should consider the depth of faith which lead Haatib to Badr, to put himself in the charge of RasulAllah out of love for Allah and for His Prophet, over and above his affection for his family and his tribe, while they had remained in their homes amidst the enemy; his resolve never slackened and his faith never weakened even though it brought him face to face on the field of battle with those who still live with his own kith and kin. But when he was corrupted by the act of spying, the strength of his faith was enough to overcome it, and as his condition worsened he rose to meet it. Thus, when the Prophet saw the strength of his faith overcomes his illness (spying), he said: “Who knows, perhaps Allah has already looked at the Badr warriors and said, ‘Do whatever you like, for I have forgiven you’”. This is the opposite of the case of Dhul Khuwaysirah at-Tamimi who challenged RasulAllah and those who followed his example; those from among the Khawaarij, whose strict observance of their ritual obligations was the envy even of the Companions of RasulAllah, but of whom RasulAllah said: “If I shall meet them, I will destroy them as the people of `Aad were destroyed,” and also, “Slay them for certainly there is great merit, with Allah, in killing them.” (Bukhari Muslim) My own thoughts are that Imam Malik, Ibn Aqeel and others from among Imam Ahmad's circle are correct in saying that the Muslim spy should be killed, since the pardon in the case of Hatib was of a kind that could not be applied to anyone else. If it was Islam which had protected him, then it would not have been necessary to grant him any special pardon; because if a ruling is justified by the general, the particular will be of no effect. This seems the more reasonable analysis, although Allah is Most Knowledgeable of the correct course. This was quoted as evidence by those who do not think that the Muslim spy should be killed, such as al-Shaafi, Ahmad and Abu Haneefah (may Allah have mercy on them). And it was quoted as evidence by those who think that the spy should be killed, such as Malik and Ibn ‘Aqeel among the companions of Ahmad, and others. They said: This is because the reason for not killing him was that he had been present at Badr. If being Muslim was the reason for not killing him, he would not have given a reason that is more specific, which is the fact that he had been present at Badr. Thus bad conditions which will loosen the strength in one's body and weaken it can arise and thus the body will not be able to take advantage of the good cause and beneficial sustenance. Yet those bad and spoiled substances will change them into their own nature and with them only will the illness increase in the body. Sometimes appropriate causes which strengthen the body could be present and because of them the bad causes will never be able to harm the body. Inasmuch that the good causes may change them into their own nature. The substances which necessitate the health or the corruption are similar to this. Think of the state of Iblis! Because the substance of destruction is hidden in his essence, with its presence he has not been able to take advantage of his doings of the past and he has returned to his original deserved character. The individual who has pulled away from that which Allah has given evidence of and the individual who is led by the shaytan are like also

reminiscent of this. Trust is for, the secrets hidden within, the intention, the purpose and the endeavor. It is such a potion it will either turn deeds of copper into gold, or it will turn it into ashes. Success is from Allah. An individual who has a sound mind will know the value of this issue and the need for it also how to take advantage of it. And by this issue he will be well aware of the talent and wisdom of Allah ta'ala behind His creation, in His commands, in His merit, in His punishment, in His commands of equating, in His transmission of delight and anguish in dunya and akhirah and the differentiation of rank in all of these. The tale of Hatib illustrates the permissibility of killing spies even when they are Muslims, since when Umar wanted to kill Hatib RasulAllah did not say: "You can't kill a Muslim", rather, he said: "Who knows, perhaps Allah has already looked at the Badr warriors and said, 'Do like'. So his response indicates that Haatib was spared only because he was a veteran of Badr. This leads us to conclude that it is permitted to kill a spy who is not protected by such a circumstance. This is the position of Imam Malik. Imam ash-Sha'fii and Abu Hanifah say that a Muslim spy should not be killed. The Hanbalis are divided, though the opinion of Imam Ahmed appears to be against killing a Muslim spy. Both sides found their arguments in the story of Hatib. In the final analysis, the decision must be that of the Imam. If the interests of the Muslims are best served by his death then he should be killed, but if these interests are better served by sparing his life then this is what should be done. Allah is best informed of the correct course." (Zaad al-Maad, 2)

Being a spy against the Muslim is kufr but in some conditions –like Hatib's incident- it will be a major sin (it will not take them out from the fold of Islam) and after the judgment and investigation under the light of evidences the spy may get punished (hadd) and this may cause him to be killed. Hatib (ra) did not perform any kufr but he performed a major sin which had been forgiven because of being a warrior in Badr and for this reason he was not punished 'Do whatever you like, I have forgiven you.' His excuse was his family and kids in Mecca. His excuse was accepted by Allah "O ye who believe!" (al-Mumtahina 1) and His messenger (saw) "Hatib has told you the truth."; but he was criticized for his action against the Muslim; "Of no profit to you will be your relatives and your children on the Day of Judgment: He will judge between you: for Allah sees well all that ye do." (al-Mumtahina 60/3)

How great is Allah that he protects his deen from the lies of the liars, the heresy of the heretics and the extremeness of the extreme.

g- Incident of Dhaat Anwat

Tirmidhi reported, that Abu Waqid al Laythi said: "We went out with RasulAllah (saw) on a campaign against Hunaiyn, while we had barely left our old paganism for Islam. It was the practice of the unbelievers to hang their arms and armor on a tree called Dhat Anwaat. When we passed by a similar tree, we asked RasulAllah (saw): "Wouldn't you establish for us another Dhat Anwaat, just as they have one?" RasulAllah (saw) answered: 'Allahu Akbar! You have now spoken exactly like Banu Isra'il did to Musa: 'Make unto us a god just as their gods!' Certainly you are an ignorant people. Must you follow exactly the same patterns as those that went before

you?” (Tirmidhi; Ahmad, Musnad; Ibn Abi Asim, Kitab As-sunnah; Ibn Hibban, Sahih; Ibn Hajar, al-Isabah)

Dhat Anwaat is the name of the tree which the mushrik Arabs would hang their weapons, make tawaf around it, expected barakah from and a tree which they made sacrifices beside. Because the mushrik expected barakah from this tree they performed such acts around it. (an-Nihayah fi Garibil athar, 2/294; Lisan’ul Arab 7/418; Tahzibul Luga, 4/484)

Anwaat is the plural of hawt which means clinging or hanging i.e something upon things which are hung. They used to hang their weapons on it to seek blessing from it. His (saw) words ‘these are the ways...’ means the paths which the people travel along, some of them following others. So the reason which led you to this is the following the ways of those who came before you and the imitation of the mushrikeen. The hadith shows the danger of resembling the mushrikeen and the fact that it leads to shirk. It is not permissible to resemble the mushrikeen. RasulAllah (saw) said: “Whoever imitates a people is one of them.” (Abu Dawud; Ahmad; Ibn Taymiyyah, Siraatil Mustaqim).

Mainly there occur two doubts. First doubt is the one those who claim ignorance is an excuse in asluddeen state “Those to whom hujjah had been established (meaning the book and sunnah has reached) and those who although carry the power of learning the hukm of the Qur’an; are excused for having a kufr belief or performing an act of kufr due to being ignorant of such knowledge of such belief or act being kufr”. This certainly is a great mistake and it is deviating the evidence by bringing forth the hadith of Dhat Anwaat as proof.

According to the claim of such individuals: “This hadith tells us that some of the companions supposedly did not have a complete knowledge of tawhid had asked RasulAllah (saw) to permit them to hang their swords on a tree so that their swords would be blessed by it, like the kuffar did with their swords. As a result of this act RasulAllah (saw) did not say that they had disbelieved and he did not tell them that they had to formally renew their faith in Islam or had to renew their marriage contracts. Rather he warned them that what they asked him to do was like what the Israelites asked Musa to do. He excused them because of their ignorance and told them that their request was clearly disbelief. He said that their words were disbelief, but he did not say that they were disbelievers.”

The second doubt concerning the issue which is presented by so-called jihaadis. The so-called contemporary jihaadi scholars fabricated a view and attributed it to the ulamaa of Najd, also claimed; although the sahabah (ra) performed kufr they did not become kafir because they had not performed kufr yet merely asked for it (kufr). This surely is great slander to RasulAllah (saw) his sahabah (ra) and the ulamaa of Najd (ra).

Abdulqadir ibn Abdulaziz has brought an usul for this situation and according to this usul; he brings forth a definition and claims when a muslim individual who is new in Islam performs any act that will take him to kufr this act will not befall him into kufr because he is excused for being ignorant. In reality the situation is certainly the opposite of this claim in which surprisingly he also mentions in many parts of his book. The individual who performs a sin which will take him to kufr will become kafir merely for abandoning or performing. To make takfir of such

individual it is not permissible to make a condition that he has to deny a waajib or that he has to make istihlal of a haraam. The reason is because Allah ta'ala had attributed him as a kafir for merely abandoning or performing and had not brought any record of denial or making istihlal. An individual who brings forth such condition will have brought an addition by seeing the hukm of Allah insufficient. Regarding making takfir of those who perform a sin which will lead to kufr, the salaf had made takfir of the Murjia who accept denial as a condition on its own.

Abdulqadir ibn Adbulaziz in 'al-jami fi talabi ilmi-sh sharif' stated "Here although they had requested something that is shirk, Nabi (saw) did not make takfir of them and because they had been new in Islam he had excused their ignorance. This is among the situations which ignorance is an excuse... This request was shirk however they did not know this because they had newly entered Islam. They had been among those who became Muslim when Macca had been conquered. Less than a month after Macca had been conquered they went on the battle of Hunayn with RasulAllah. They did'nt have sufficient time to learn Islam."

One among the so-called jihadi ulamaa Abu Hamza al-Misra said: "For example, when the sahabah asked the Prophet to make the Dhat Anwaat, he did not call them kuffar, but he said this is equivalent to asking for a god other than Allah. Although it was an act of kufr and blasphemy, they were not declared kuffar. This is because they only asked about it; they did not do the act." (Khawaarij and Jihaad)

This view also mentioned by Abu Hamzah al-Afghany (follower of Abu Maryam al-Mukhlif) in one of his books and he said: "The Sahabah asked Allah for something they could worship besides Him. Without a doubt, one who asks for such a thing is a Mushrik and leaves this Deen, even if he is not aware of the error in his deed. For in reality such a person never even entered Islam, even if his Shirk was not apparent to the people before. So if one who wants to commit Shirk without knowing that Shirk is forbidden, such a person is a Mushrik and not a Muslim, as the clear proofs which were already mentioned before show. This would mean that the Sahabah who are referred to in the Hadith of Dhat Anwaat became Mushrikeen, which is indeed possible according to the text in the Hadith. It must not necessarily be narrated that he (sas) called them to repent or said to them that they had left the Deen or that they became Mushrikeen. They however immediately took back their request, let alone following their request with deeds. According to this interpretation, they are exactly like those of Banu Israel. The Sahabah were new in the Deen and therefore were not considered as becoming Kuffar, who ought to be punished. The punishment of Kufr can only exist after the receipt of the evidences. This is what the scholars of the dawah Najdiyyah meant, such as Abd ur-Rahman ibnu Hassan in Fathu'l-Majeed" and Sulaimaan ibnu Abdullah in "Taisir il-Aziz il-Hamid". None of them ever claimed, not even once, that the Sahabah were not Mushrik at the time of this request (because the Sahabah did not know that this request contradicts the basis of Islam, even though this was not apparent until then. What they said was that the Sahabah did not become Kuffar (because they were ignorant, in other words they did not deny the Truth). The Juhaal however do not know the books of the scholars of dawah Najdiyyah apart from a few small parts which they are pleased with after they have interpreted them wrongly. The scholars of dawah Najdiyyah also used this Hadith in order to show that someone who makes such a request but does not however implement it as deeds, such a person remains Muslim and does not fall out of Islam as long as he immediately recognizes the Truth, accepts it and acts upon it (in this case, by abstaining from doing the action

he asked to do). One does not speak here of overstepping the boundaries of Islam because the Sahabah changed their opinion immediately, understood the correct Islam, accepted it and realized that they did not understand and accept it before. The scholars of the dawah Najdiyyah knew exactly that when one says to another, "Come, let us call this waliyullah for help (in matters which only Allah is capable of doing)", he immediately becomes a Mushrik due to the Shirk which is present in this statement and due to the Shirk which is present in his heart even if he ultimately does not carry out the deed which he intended to do. They knew these facts with certainty and anyone who reads their books will become sure of that."

First of all these doubts are presented by the mushrik at the past and today. While Muhammad ibn Abdulwahhab in 'Kashfu Shubuhah' replies to those who make such claims he begins his statement by saying: "But the Mushrikeen have an argument that they use to try to refute the proper understanding of this story, and that is that they say: the Children of Israel did not become kafir by this action of theirs, and neither did the Companions when they asked RasulAllah (saw) to make for them a Dhat Anwaat." The Muslim will know that an individual will only become Muslim after having knowledge of shirk and abandoning it. According to this such doubts will not occur by the Muslim. However it will be attributed to those who claim "an individual can be Muslim even before cleansing from shirk."

When we take this incident in hand we can assume that:

The Sahabah requested from RasulAllah (saw) for Shirk Asghar (minor Shirk; a sin which can easily lead to Shirk Akbar, or a sin which is described as Shirk but does not exclude one from Deen). They requested from him to invoke Allah to make for them a tree, through which He will give them barakah (blessing) so that they can hang their weapons onto it. The blessing from the tree should shift to the weapons so that they could successfully fight the Kuffar. This action is considered as Shirk Asghar due to the following reasons:

- 1- There is no scholar who considered it as shirk-akbar.
- 2- They asked for something which was regarded as imitation of the kuffar (tashabuh bil-kuffar).
- 3- It contained imitating the kuffar in a matter concerning their worship for something other than Allah in a similar way and in a similar place, resembling the Shirk of the idolaters.
- 4- It was a method which could have led the people to Shirk Akbar. People would be inclined to begin worshipping the tree itself (beginning to regard the tree itself as the provider of blessing) especially because they desired the tree for the fight against their enemy.
- 5- The increased fear existed that people could fall in Shirk Akbar since the Mushrik had the habit of worshipping something other than Allah exactly at this location.
- 6- How could it be possible that those sahabah did not know that making dua to Dhat Anwaat had been kufr? Since dua is the most common act of worship, it is also the most common act of shirk! This type of shirk had been very popular among the Arabs and RasulAllah (saw) had been mostly against this type of shirk during his dawah of tawhid. When the name of Muhammad

(saw) had been mentioned, it came to the minds of everyone was the denial of ibadaah to the idols. If they had not known this shirk they could not have been or become Muslim, hence a condition of becoming Muslim is knowledge of shirk and the rejection of it.

Due to this RasulAllah (saw) pointed out their mistake in such a strict manner, comparing their statement with the one from Banu Israel. The use of the letter "Kaf" on its own in this hadith however does not mean in the Arabic language 'to be completely identical' to something; one item may also differ from the other in a few points. The implication of this partial comparison from RasulAllah (saw) for the Sahabah (who were new in Islam) was to show them the degree of the falseness of their request and thereby to frighten them away from it strongly.

Furthermore, one does not find in the reason of the prohibition which is mentioned in the Hadith any mention of shirk akbar. The mushrik hung up their weapons on the tree, however merely hanging up the weapons without worshipping the tree itself, this is a door which leads to shirk but on its own however, is not shirk. So the sahabah asking for a tree on which they could hang up their weapons was an imitation of the kuffar but not any act of worship of the tree. The request of the sahabah (ra) from RasulAllah (saw) does not show that they wanted to worship the tree. They merely asked for a tree on which they could hang up their weapons.

1- The Difference between requesting from the created and requesting from the Creator through the created

Fundamentally the reality is those who make such requests are those who have not abandoned kufr. Above all this they (the ashab) have requested this yet they have not performed it. The scholars have notified with certainty the following: Surely they had only requested a situation which was similar to theirs (the mushrik) in having a tree. They would have hung their weapons and with the rahmah Allah pouring upon them they would request help from Allah. Obviously this would not be requesting help directly from the tree. The similarity between the sahabah and the mushrik would only be the request of having a tree which they could hang their weaponry. They wanted Allah to help them by pouring rahmah over the tree. They did not request help from the tree. On the contrary they requested this from Allah through His Nabi (saw). As mentioned before they were expecting victory from Allah through the tree but not directly from the tree. Likewise in a sahih hadith the following is stated: Muslim related from Abu Malik al Ash'ari (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) said: "Four undesirable customs still persist in my ummah from pre-Islamic times: pride in the noble achievements of one's relatives, attack of weak genealogies, seeking rain through the stars and bewailing the deceased." Muslim and Bukhari related that Zayd ibn Khalid (ra) said: "RasulAllah (saw) led our dawn prayer at Hudaybiyah after a light rain had fallen on us in the night. When the prayer was completed, he asked the people present: 'Do you know what your Lord has revealed?' They answered: 'Allah and His Prophet know better.'" He said: 'Allah said: Some of my servants have become believers in Me as well as unbelievers at the same time. Whoever holds that the rain fell on us by Allah's kindness and mercy is a believer in Me, an unbeliever in the star. But whoever holds that rain fell on us by virtue of the movement of such and such star is a believer in the star, not in Me'. Ibn 'Abbas reported this hadith with differing terminology. It is because the pre-Islamic Arabs used to say, "The naw' of such and such star has come true whenever a rain fell," that Allah revealed the following verses: "Certainly, I shall not swear by the position of the stars; for such

would be a grave oath, if only you knew ... Are you making lying your business and career?" (al-Waqia 56/75-82)" (Kitabu Tawhid)

Zayd ibn Khaalid al-Juhani said: "RasulAllah (saw) led us in Subh (Fajr) prayer at al-Hudaybiyah just after it had rained in the night. When he finished, he turned to the people and said, 'Do you know what your Lord says?' They said, 'Allah and His Messenger know best.' He said, 'This morning one of My slaves became a believer in Me, and one a disbeliever. As for the one who said, we have been given rain by the Grace and Mercy of Allah, he is a believer in Me and a disbeliever in the stars; and as for him who said, we have been given rain by such-and-such a star, he is a disbeliever in Me and a believer in the stars.'" (Bukhari)

Fundamentally the statement 'our rain is due to so and so star' is bid'ah and minor shirk. However whoever claims that the star itself is what made it rain he has made shirk in the rububiyyah of Allah. It is a known fact that the shirk mentioned here is of two types. Performing shirk in the Rububiyyah of Allah and believing the stars have such power which is major shirk and to believe that the reason for the rain is the stars is minor shirk. Those who made the request of dhat anwaat did not expect the blessing from the tree itself yet they expected the blessing from Allah and for Allah to make that place holy and this is not something which takes one directly out of the fold of Islam.

When it comes to those who requested dhat anwaat... They wanted to request help from Allah through the tree. They were not going to request help from the tree perse. However with this request there is the illah of resembling the mushrik. They had also wanted this in order to request help. However with the dangerous situation they had fallen into they had resembled the mushrik. For this reason in order to destroy this similarity from its roots RasulAllah (saw) had said: 'Allahu Akbar! You have now spoken exactly like the Banu Israel did to Musa: 'Make unto us a god just as their gods!''

As it is known the one who wants to resemble will resemble that which he wants to resemble in many ways and he will remain in other parts. He will not resemble completely or else he will be a member of such type. As known something resembling another can be only in one way or also can resemble in many ways. One thing resembling another does not necessitate it to resemble it completely. One can only resemble another completely if they are of the same type. Just as in the following statement of RasulAllah (saw): "An alcoholic is just like an idolworshipper" (Ibn Majah)

Surely each individual with a sound mind will comprehend that the similarity between an alcoholic and an idol worshipper is that they both rebel against Allah. It is known that the alcoholic does not leave the fold of Islam by drinking and the idolator is kafir regardless therefore they differentiate. Regarding this hadith Ibn Qayyim in his source "Uddatus sabirun wa Zakhiratus Shakireen" in the bab which he mentions which one of shukr and sabr are more virtuous he states: "...The level of the one resembled to is higher than the one that resembles. In the hadith the one who feeds and makes shukr is the one that resembles and the one that fasts and is patient is the one resembled to. For example in another hadith it had been stated 'the alcoholic is like the idol worshipper'.

For those who read the Qur'an righteously who think and comprehend it this usage is common. The following ayah from our Rabb is one of the best examples: "O ye who believe! cancel not your charity by reminders of your generosity or by injury,- like those who spend their substance to be seen of men, but believe neither in Allah nor in the Last Day...." (al-Baqarah 2/264)

The resemblance here is regarding the sadaqa turning out be useless and that it will not be inclusive of not believing in Allah and the akhirah. The reason is because an individual resembling in one matter does not necessitate that he resembles in complete.

The following hadith is also the same: "So you will have no difficulty in seeing your Lord on that Day as you have no difficulty in seeing the sun and the moon (in a clear sky)." (Bukhari)

As understood the resemblance here is in the sense of sight and clarity. It is not in the sense of shape and quality. Wa a'udhu billah. Here the Banu Isra'il had requested resembling the mushrik in major shirk. However those in the incident of dhat anwaat had requested to resemble the mushrik in minor shirk and they had stopped their act there. It is known that the resemblance in this hadith is in the sense of sight and clarity. In the same sense in the mentioned hadith of dhat anwaat there had been a request from the banu isra'il to resemble the mushrik. However this resemblance had been in major shirk yet the request of the muslim was a request of resemblance which had been minor shirk. Yet in time this could have led to major shirk because in time bid'ah leads to major shirk.

Likewise the first shirk which had been established on earth was the making of the idols in the frame of salih individuals. Later this had been forgotten and these statues began to be worshipped. This portrayal of idols later became means of shirk.

There is a feature which catches the eye in the method of the shaitan when he leads astray, that is he never says "perform shirk against Allah". He will begin with unlawful tawassul and other bid'ah. First salah will be performed by graves, later shafaa will be requested from the graves and this act will go all the way to shirk. It is the same in other sins also. If the shaitan says to someone 'fornicate' the individual will reject, yet if the shaitan inspires a man to meet a woman, to build friendship and to be alone, this will in most cases conclude in fornication etc. RasulAllah (saw) had made commandments to close the paths which lead to shirk and which lead to sinning. It is in the usul of fiqh that the mediums which take to haraam are also haraam. This is called Sadd-e-Zarai (avoiding means of evil).

"And they said: You shall not forsake your deities/gods, nor shall you forsake Wadd, nor Suwaa', nor Yaghooth, nor Ya'ooq, nor Nasr." (Nuh 71/23)

Ibn Kathir said: "And they have plotted a mighty plot. And they have said: 'You shall not leave your gods, nor shall you leave Wadd, nor Suwa', nor Yaghuth, and Ya'uq and Nasr.' These are the names of their idols which they used to worship besides Allah. Bukhari recorded from Ibn Abbas that he said, "The idols that were among the people of Nuh wound up among the Arabs afterwards. In reference to Wadd, it became the idol of the people of Kalb in the area of Dawmat Al-Jandal. Suwa' became the idol of the

people of Hudhayl. Yaghuth became the idol of the people of Murad, then the people of Bani Ghutayf at Al-Juruf in the area of Saba' worshipped it after them. Ya'uq became the idol of the people of Hamdan. Nasr became the idol of the people of Himyar for the family of Dhu Kala'. These idols were all named after righteous men from the people of Nuh. Then when these men died, Shaitan inspired his (Nuh's) people to erect statues in honor of them at their gathering places where they used to come and sit, and to name these statues after these men (with their names). So they did this (as Shaitan suggested), but these statues were not worshipped until after those people (the ones who built them) had died and the knowledge was lost. Then, those statues were later worshipped." This has also been similarly reported from `Ikrimah, Ad-Dahhak, Qatadah and Ibn Ishaq. `Ali bin Abi Talhah reported from Ibn `Abbas that he said, "These are statues that were worshipped in the time of Nuh." Ibn Jarir recorded from Muhammad bin Qays that he said concerning Yaghuth, Ya'uq and Nasr, "They were righteous people between the time of Adam and Nuh, and they had followers who used to adhere to their guidance. Then, when they died, their companions who used to follow them said, 'If we make images of them, it will increase our desire to perform worship when we remember them.' So they made images of them. Then, when those people died and other people came after them, Iblis approached them and said, 'They (your predecessors) used to worship these statues and they were granted rain by their worship of them.' Thus, they (the latter people) worshipped them." (Tafsir Ibn Kathir)

Qurtubi (ra) said in Jami li-Ahkamil-Qur'an: "The initial images that were made of these righteous men were done in order that the people could be reminded about their righteousness and so strive in being righteous; as they strove. So they worshipped Allah by the graves of these righteous men. Then a people came after them who forgot the intent of their fore-fathers' actions. So the Shaitan whispered to them saying: Your fore-fathers used to worship these images and held them in great veneration." (Tafsir)

Tabari narrated: "Muhammad Ibn Qays (ra) said: Yaghooth, Ya'ooq and Nasr were a group of righteous men, who were taken as examples to be followed by their people. So when they died their companions said: If we were to make pictures of them it would encourage us to do acts of worship and obedience to Allah (as they did). So they made pictures of them. However, when they died and the next generation came, Shaitan whispered to them saying: Your fore-fathers used to worship these righteous men, and it was due to them that it rained. So they began to worship them." (Tafsir)

It is the same with the graveyards. As it is not shirk to stand by the graves, it is haraam in the sharee'ah to build masjids over graves to put a barrier for possible shirk, as many do fall into major shirk due to many veneration regarding those in the graves.

If it is said: 'if their request had only been due to resemblance, why did RasulAllah (saw) say "...You have now spoken exactly like Banu Isra'il did to Musa"?

As an answer to this it would be said that this is a type of evaluation of matters and it is an exaggeration. This is just like the strong and harsh reaction of RasulAllah (saw) to the man who said "... Allah and you will". Although the man had not performed major shirk RasulAllah (saw) had said to him: "You have put an equal with Allah?" Ibn Abbas said, "A man said, to the Prophet, 'Whatever Allah wills and you will.' He

said, 'You have put an equal with Allah. It is what Allah alone wills.'" Ibn Abbas reported that a man said, "O RasulAllah, whatever Allah and you will." He said, "Are you making me equal to Allah? [Say instead:] What Allah alone wills." (Ahmad, Musnad; Nasai, Amalu'l-Yawmi wa'l-Layl; Abdu'r-Razzak, al-Musannaf; Bukhari, al-Adabu'l-Mufrad; Ibn Majah)

Shatibi stated from the past ummah especially regarding submitting to the bid'ah of the ahl kitab: The hadith of RasulAllah (saw) "Until my ummah tread the same path as was trodden by those before you..." shows they will do much more than them. However he does not only touch upon them submitting to the same bid'ah on the contrary maybe they will submit to the same also similar ones. The hadith which explains the first is "Until my ummah tread the same path as was trodden by those before you..." Here he says "...if they should go into the hole of a mastigure, you too will go there." (Bukhari) The hadith which shows the second situation is supposedly this "Wouldn't you establish for us another Dhat Anwaat... RasulAllah (saw) answered... You have now spoken exactly like Banu Isra'il did to Musa." Surely attaining dhat anwaat resembles attaining deities other than Allah. However this does not mean attaining it per se. For this reason it is not necessary to regard the explained. Until something similar shows it at all points. Wallahu alam (itisam, 2/245-246)

When imam Shatibi explains the submittance to the bid'ah of the ahl kitab, after he explains that the Muslim will perform the same bid'ah as the past ummah he mentions this hadith and says "surely attaining dhat anwaat is similar to attaining deities other than Allah. However this is not attaining another deity per se." (Itisam, 2/296) **1- The Difference between requesting from the created and requesting from the Creator through the created**

Fundamentally the reality is those who make such requests are those who have not abandoned kufr. Above all this they (the ashab) have requested this yet they have not performed it. The scholars have notified with certainty the following: Surely they had only requested a situation which was similar to theirs (the mushrik) in having a tree. They would have hung their weapons and with the rahmah Allah pouring upon them they would request help from Allah. Obviously this would not be requesting help directly from the tree. The similarity between the sahabah and the mushrik would only be the request of having a tree which they could hang their weaponry. They wanted Allah to help them by pouring rahmah over the tree. They did not request help from the tree. On the contrary they requested this from Allah through His Nabi (saw). As mentioned before they were expecting victory from Allah through the tree but not directly from the tree. Likewise in a sahih hadith the following is stated: Muslim related from Abu Malik al Ash'ari (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) said: "Four undesirable customs still persist in my ummah from pre-Islamic times: pride in the noble achievements of one's relatives, attack of weak genealogies, seeking rain through the stars and bewailing the deceased." Muslim and Bukhari related that Zayd ibn Khalid (ra) said: "RasulAllah (saw) led our dawn prayer at Hudaybiyah after a light rain had fallen on us in the night. When the prayer was completed, he asked the people present: 'Do you know what your Lord has revealed?' They answered: 'Allah and His Prophet know better.'" He said: 'Allah said: Some of my servants have become believers in Me as well as unbelievers at the same time. Whoever holds that the rain fell on us by Allah's kindness and mercy is a believer in Me, an unbeliever in the star. But whoever holds that rain fell on us by virtue of the movement of such and such star is a believer in

the star, not in Me'. Ibn 'Abbas reported this hadith with differing terminology. It is because the pre-Islamic Arabs used to say, "The naw' of such and such star has come true whenever a rain fell," that Allah revealed the following verses: "Certainly, I shall not swear by the position of the stars; for such would be a grave oath, if only you knew ... Are you making lying your business and career?" (al-Waqia 56/75-82)" (Kitabu Tawhid)

Zayd ibn Khaalid al-Juhani said: "RasulAllah (saw) led us in Subh (Fajr) prayer at al-Hudaybiyah just after it had rained in the night. When he finished, he turned to the people and said, 'Do you know what your Lord says?' They said, 'Allah and His Messenger know best.' He said, 'This morning one of My slaves became a believer in Me, and one a disbeliever. As for the one who said, we have been given rain by the Grace and Mercy of Allah, he is a believer in Me and a disbeliever in the stars; and as for him who said, we have been given rain by such-and-such a star, he is a disbeliever in Me and a believer in the stars.'" (Bukhari)

Fundamentally the statement 'our rain is due to so and so star' is bid'ah and minor shirk. However whoever claims that the star itself is what made it rain he has made shirk in the rububiyyah of Allah. It is a known fact that the shirk mentioned here is of two types. Performing shirk in the Rububiyyah of Allah and believing the stars have such power which is major shirk and to believe that the reason for the rain is the stars is minor shirk. Those who made the request of dhat anwaat did not expect the blessing from the tree itself yet they expected the blessing from Allah and for Allah to make that place holy and this is not something which takes one directly out of the fold of Islam.

When it comes to those who requested dhat anwaat... They wanted to request help from Allah through the tree. They were not going to request help from the tree perse. However with this request there is the illah of resembling the mushrik. They had also wanted this in order to request help. However with the dangerous situation they had fallen into they had resembled the mushrik. For this reason in order to destroy this similarity from its roots RasulAllah (saw) had said: 'Allahu Akbar! You have now spoken exactly like the Banu Israel did to Musa: 'Make unto us a god just as their gods!''

As it is known the one who wants to resemble will resemble that which he wants to resemble in many ways and he will remain in other parts. He will not resemble completely or else he will be a member of such type. As known something resembling another can be only in one way or also can resemble in many ways. One thing resembling another does not necessitate it to resemble it completely. One can only resemble another completely if they are of the same type. Just as in the following statement of RasulAllah (saw): "An alcoholic is just like an idolworshipper" (Ibn Majah)

Surely each individual with a sound mind will comprehend that the similarity between an alcoholic and an idol worshipper is that they both rebel against Allah. It is known that the alcoholic does not leave the fold of Islam by drinking and the idolator is kafir regardless therefore they differentiate. Regarding this hadith Ibn Qayyim in his source "Uddatus sabirun wa Zakhiratus Shakireen" in the bab which he mentions which one of shukr and sabr are more virtuous he states: "...The level of the one resembled to is higher than the one that resembles. In the hadith the one who feeds and makes shukr is the one that

resembles and the one that fasts and is patient is the one resembled to. For example in another hadith it had been stated 'the alcoholic is like the idol worshipper'.

For those who read the Qur'an righteously who think and comprehend it this usage is common. The following ayah from our Rabb is one of the best examples: "O ye who believe! cancel not your charity by reminders of your generosity or by injury,- like those who spend their substance to be seen of men, but believe neither in Allah nor in the Last Day...." (al-Baqarah 2/264)

The resemblance here is regarding the sadaqa turning out be useless and that it will not be inclusive of not believing in Allah and the akhirah. The reason is because an individual resembling in one matter does not necessitate that he resembles in complete.

The following hadith is also the same: "So you will have no difficulty in seeing your Lord on that Day as you have no difficulty in seeing the sun and the moon (in a clear sky)." (Bukhari)

As understood the resemblance here is in the sense of sight and clarity. It is not in the sense of shape and quality. Wa a'udhu billah. Here the Banu Isra'il had requested resembling the mushrik in major shirk. However those in the incident of dhat anwaat had requested to resemble the mushrik in minor shirk and they had stopped their act there. It is known that the resemblance in this hadith is in the sense of sight and clarity. In the same sense in the mentioned hadith of dhat anwaat there had been a request from the banu isra'il to resemble the mushrik. However this resemblance had been in major shirk yet the request of the muslim was a request of resemblance which had been minor shirk. Yet in time this could have led to major shirk because in time bid'ah leads to major shirk.

Likewise the first shirk which had been established on earth was the making of the idols in the frame of salih individuals. Later this had been forgotten and these statues began to be worshipped. This portrayal of idols later became means of shirk.

There is a feature which catches the eye in the method of the shaitan when he leads astray, that is he never says "perform shirk against Allah". He will begin with unlawful tawassul and other bid'ah. First salah will be performed by graves, later shafaa will be requested from the graves and this act will go all the way to shirk. It is the same in other sins also. If the shaitan says to someone 'fornicate' the individual will reject, yet if the shaitan inspires a man to meet a woman, to build friendship and to be alone, this will in most cases conclude in fornication etc. RasulAllah (saw) had made commandments to close the paths which lead to shirk and which lead to sinning. It is in the usul of fiqh that the mediums which take to haraam are also haraam. This is called Sadd-e-Zarai (avoiding means of evil).

"And they said: You shall not forsake your deities/gods, nor shall you forsake Wadd, nor Suwaa', nor Yaghooth, nor Ya'ooq, nor Nasr." (Nuh 71/23)

Ibn Kathir said: "And they have plotted a mighty plot. And they have said: 'You shall not leave your gods, nor shall you leave Wadd, nor Suwa', nor Yaghuth, and Ya'uq and Nasr.' These are the names of their

idols which they used to worship besides Allah. Bukhari recorded from Ibn Abbas that he said, "The idols that were among the people of Nuh wound up among the Arabs afterwards. In reference to Wadd, it became the idol of the people of Kalb in the area of Dawmat Al-Jandal. Suwa` became the idol of the people of Hudhayl. Yaghuth became the idol of the people of Murad, then the people of Bani Ghutayf at Al-Juruf in the area of Saba' worshipped it after them. Ya`uq became the idol of the people of Hamdan. Nasr became the idol of the people of Himyar for the family of Dhu Kala`. These idols were all named after righteous men from the people of Nuh. Then when these men died, Shaitan inspired his (Nuh's) people to erect statues in honor of them at their gathering places where they used to come and sit, and to name these statues after these men (with their names). So they did this (as Shaitan suggested), but these statues were not worshipped until after those people (the ones who built them) had died and the knowledge was lost. Then, those statues were later worshipped." This has also been similarly reported from `Ikrimah, Ad-Dahhak, Qatadah and Ibn Ishaq. `Ali bin Abi Talhah reported from Ibn `Abbas that he said, "These are statues that were worshipped in the time of Nuh." Ibn Jarir recorded from Muhammad bin Qays that he said concerning Yaghuth, Ya`uq and Nasr, "They were righteous people between the time of Adam and Nuh, and they had followers who used to adhere to their guidance. Then, when they died, their companions who used to follow them said, 'If we make images of them, it will increase our desire to perform worship when we remember them.' So they made images of them. Then, when those people died and other people came after them, Iblis approached them and said, 'They (your predecessors) used to worship these statues and they were granted rain by their worship of them.' Thus, they (the latter people) worshipped them." (Tafsir Ibn Kathir)

Qurtubi (ra) said in Jami li-Ahkamil-Qur'an: "The initial images that were made of these righteous men were done in order that the people could be reminded about their righteousness and so strive in being righteous; as they strove. So they worshipped Allah by the graves of these righteous men. Then a people came after them who forgot the intent of their fore-fathers' actions. So the Shaitan whispered to them saying: Your fore-fathers used to worship these images and held them in great veneration." (Tafsir)

Tabari narrated: "Muhammad Ibn Qays (ra) said: Yaghooth, Ya'ooq and Nasr were a group of righteous men, who were taken as examples to be followed by their people. So when they died their companions said: If we were to make pictures of them it would encourage us to do acts of worship and obedience to Allah (as they did). So they made pictures of them. However, when they died and the next generation came, Shaitan whispered to them saying: Your fore-fathers used to worship these righteous men, and it was due to them that it rained. So they began to worship them." (Tafsir)

It is the same with the graveyards. As it is not shirk to stand by the graves, it is haraam in the sharee'ah to build masjids over graves to put a barrier for possible shirk, as many do fall into major shirk due to many veneration regarding those in the graves.

If it is said: 'if their request had only been due to resemblance, why did RasulAllah (saw) say "...You have now spoken exactly like Banu Isra'il did to Musa"?

As an answer to this it would be said that this is a type of evaluation of matters and it is an exaggeration.

This is just like the strong and harsh reaction of RasulAllah (saw) to the man who said "... Allah and you will". Although the man had not performed major shirk RasulAllah (saw) had said to him: "You have put an equal with Allah?" Ibn Abbas said, "A man said, to the Prophet, 'Whatever Allah wills and you will.' He said, 'You have put an equal with Allah. It is what Allah alone wills.'" Ibn Abbas reported that a man said, "O RasulAllah, whatever Allah and you will." He said, "Are you making me equal to Allah? [Say instead:] What Allah alone wills." (Ahmad, Musnad; Nasai, Amalu'l-Yawmi wa'l-Layl; Abdu'r-Razzak, al-Musannaf; Bukhari, al-Adabu'l-Mufrad; Ibn Majah)

Shatibi stated from the past ummah especially regarding submitting to the bid'ah of the ahl kitab: The hadith of RasulAllah (saw) "Until my ummah tread the same path as was trodden by those before you..." shows they will do much more than them. However he does not only touch upon them submitting to the same bid'ah on the contrary maybe they will submit to the same also similar ones. The hadith which explains the first is "Until my ummah tread the same path as was trodden by those before you..." Here he says "...if they should go into the hole of a mastigure, you too will go there." (Bukhari) The hadith which shows the second situation is supposedly this "Wouldn't you establish for us another Dhat Anwaat... RasulAllah (saw) answered... You have now spoken exactly like Banu Isra'il did to Musa." Surely attaining dhat anwaat resembles attaining deities other than Allah. However this does not mean attaining it per se. For this reason it is not necessary to regard the explained. Until something similar shows it at all points. Wallahu alam (Itisam, 2/245-246)

When imam Shatibi explains the submittance to the bid'ah of the ahl kitab, after he explains that the Muslim will perform the same bid'ah as the past ummah he mentions this hadith and says "surely attaining dhat anwaat is similar to attaining deities other than Allah. However this is not attaining another deity per se." (Itisam, 2/296)

2- The tribe had only requested resemblance!

The above explanation of Shatibi shows that surely this tribe had not requested major shirk. On the contrary they had only requested resemblance, a similarity. This request was similar to the request of the banu Isra'il yet it is not exactly like it. Building upon this until their similarities are proven to be the same in all possible dimensions, it cannot be taken under consideration that their kufr was the same.

"They did not request major shirk. Their request only resembled the mushrik and banu Isra'il in one way. It was not the same. Meaning it did not resemble the request of the banu Isra'il from all quarters. In the nass if there isn't anything that suggests similarity in complete, the hukm that it is similar from all quarters should not be given."

Shaikh Muhammad ibn Abdulwahhab, stated the following under the chapter "Making tabarruk (conjuring) a tree or a stone" after he narrated the hadith: "Further Issues:

3- That they did not get what they asked for.

11- That shirk does admit of degrees, for they remained Muslim despite their deed." (Kitab'u Tawhid, Bab'u Man Tabarraka bi Sajarin aw Hajarin wa Nahwaha) According to this statement of the shaikh this

request of theirs is a request of minor shirk.

Ibn Taymiyyah stated: "As known during the era of RasulAllah (saw) the mushrik had a tree they called dhat anwaat. When they took a stopover they would hang their weapons from this tree. One day some of the sahabah offered RasulAllah (saw) to determine a dhat anwaat for them as the mushrik have a dhat anwaat. When he heard this offer, RasulAllah (saw) replied to these individuals with obvious fury: 'Allahu Akbar! You have now spoken exactly like Banu Isra'il did to Musa: Make unto us a god just as their gods! Certainly you are an ignorant people. Must you follow exactly the same patterns as those that went before you?' (Tirmidhi; Ahmad, Musnad) RasulAllah (saw) rebuked them for merely attempting to imitate the kuffar concerning a tree by which they wanted to stop by and hang up their weapons. What is then with the one who resembles the Mushrikeen much more or resembles Shirk itself! So he who searches for some soil because he thinks that searching for it will bring him some goodness and the sharee'ah rejects such an action and it is from the hated and one is worse than the other no matter whether it is a tree, a brook, a mountain, a cave and so on: whether he wants to pray there or supplicate or recite the Qur'an, remember Allah (swt) there or make a sacrifice. In other words a specific ibadah which he wants to perform especially in that place even though the sharee'ah has not prescribed any special treatment for this place, regardless whether at this specific place or this type of place generally." (Iqtidaa'u's-Siraat il-Mustaqeem 314-315)

While Shaikhul-Islam first takes in hand 'the restriction of resembling the kuffar' when he had been asked about the hukm of the visitation of special places and making dua to Allah or performing similar acts at those places he brings forth this narration of the hadith and said: "All of these are bid'ah. They are from the amal of the ahl jahiliyyah and the path which takes to shirk." (Majmuul Fatawa, 6/224)

In the same way while Imam Suyuti explains the matter of places which revering must not take place, he uses the same denotation as Ibn Taymiyyah and says: "Take notice how RasulAllah (saw) denies the request of their request of merely resembling the kuffar in a single manner." (al-amru bi'l-ittiba wa'n-nahyu ani'l-ibtida, 9) **3- The Difference between Tawhid, bid'ah and Shirk**

The statements of Ibn Taymiyyah show that surely this tribe had only intended to resemble the mushrik meaning there is only resemblance with the mushrik in the request of this tribe. They had not requested to believe and perform as the mushrik. One should take notice of the examples he presents. All of them are bid'ah and not major shirk. That is a slave's designation of a place, tree or creek with the hope of blessings without any evidence from Allah. Besides this, with the hope of gaining more ajr they will perform more ibadaah to Allah. This is bid'ah itself. The reason it is bid'ah is that tawhid is performing ibadaah to Allah only in the way the Messengers of Allah had prescribed.

Does not shirk mean performing ibadaah to another besides Allah? bid'ah differing from shirk is, performing ibadaah to Allah alone in an unprescribed manner by the sharee'ah. This is the description of the bid'ah which does not make one a kafir. Meaning the bid'ah the ahl qiblah had fallen into yet had not taken them out of the fold of Islam. In general along with submitting to the sharee'ah, this matter which is considered as ibadaah submittance is not determined. Or else the complete abandonment of

submittance is surely kufr. At this point the difference between a kafir and a bid'ah doer is distinguished. When we think of the kafir which let alone does not submit in some matters they abandon submittance entirely while the complete submittance of the bid'ah doer and him embracing the sharee'ah eliminates some mistakes he may have in the details of furu.

However by hoping for greater ajr, the individual who performs ibadaah solely to Allah beside Baytu'l-Haraam is a muwahhid who is acting according to the sunnah. The reason is because Allah had made this place worthier than others. The one who performs ibadaah to the deceased is a mushrik because he performs ibadaah to some other than Allah. However the individual who performs ibadaah by the graves solely to Allah without the performance of any shirk is a muwahhid yet also a bid'ah doer. The reason is he has made a place worthier than any other without any evidence from the sharee'ah. Therefore by abandoning the sunnah he has fallen into bid'ah.

Tawhid: Is performing ibadaah to the One and Only Allah according to the things which RasulAllah (saw) had perscribed by tongue. Shirk is performing ibadaah to another along with Allah. The bid'ah which does not take one to kufr is performing ibadaah to Allah generally keeping committed to the manner which Allah had perscribed, yet in certain matters performing ibadaah to Allah in a manner unsuitable to the sharee'ah.

InshaAllah by this, the difference between a kafir and a bid'ah doer has been distinguished. The kafir is the one who has abandoned the details and generally the submittance to the sharee'ah, whereas the bid'ah doer is the one who has submitted to the shairah generally yet has mistakes in the details of furu. Generally his submittance to the sharee'ah will make his mistakes in the details of furu to be forgiven, meaning he will not leave the fold of Islam.

For instance "the individual who performs ibadaah to Allah alone in Baytu'l-haraam requests/expects the greatest ajr. According to the sunnah this individual is a muwahhid because Allah had made this place worthier than others. However when it comes to the individual who performs ibadaah to the deceased he is surely a mushrik because he had performed ibadaah to some other than Allah. However when it comes to the individual who performs ibadaah to Allah alone beside a grave without performing any shirk... he is also a muwahhid because he had not performed shirk however he is also a bid'ah doer for taking a place to be worthy without any evidence from the sharee'ah. For this reason he has left the sunnah and deviated into bid'ah. After Qadi Abu Bakr Ibn Arabi narrated this he stated "RasulAllah (saw) had cautioned them from following bid'ah and commanded them to revive the sunnah." (Ibn Arabi, Ahkamul Qur'an, 4/14)

4-The slave is responsible with tawhid the moment he submits

First of all this tribe had not requested major shirk. As mentioned previously without any ikhtilaf among the ulamaa it is not permissible to delay a response at a time of need. As known the slave is accountable to embrace tawhid and beware of shirk the moment he enters Islam. According to this how could it be permissible to delay the teachings of tawhid and major shirk? Can it be thought that RasulAllah (saw)

without any delay from the getgo did not inform them of major shirk? Can it be said that as he did not inform and explain he didn't even restrict it? Can anyone think: RasulAllah (saw) had not mentioned shirk? That he did not explain nor caution against it? That he waited until shirk was seen in his ummah? That the moment he saw shirk in his ummah he said 'o man this is shirk'? Likewise when shirk is seen in hakimiyyah he would say this is shirk and when it is seen in uluhiyyah he would say surely this is also shirk do not do this again? When he found that his ummah had fallen into shirk in wala, only then he would warn them and had never mentioned it until he actually saw the shirk being performed? Can it really be thought that RasulAllah (saw) did this?

Now, if the mentioned type of shirk had not been performed, wasn't RasulAllah (saw) ever going to warn against them?

To think as such regarding the Nabi (saw) Allah had chosen to be the eminent slave would mean to think he had not performed his duties and this would be great slander to him. When he had sent Muadh to the ahl kitab although he had ordered Muadh to invite them to tawhid first and not to continue with other ibadaah until they had learnt the ilm of Allah which informs the difference between tawhid and shirk how could it be that he himself would not do this?

Surely we keep our Nabi and all other nabi and rasul distant from such deficiency and slander. Also to think as such regarding RasulAllah would necessitate that most of the sahabah had died without the true knowledge of tawhid and shirk and its performance. The individual who thinks as such should consider his iman once again and should fear Allah prior to his questioning in the grave regarding RasulAllah. Or else when he is questioned in the barzakh regarding RasulAllah he will say 'I heard others saying such things about RasulAllah so I said the same.'

How could it be permissible to delay the teaching of the basis of tawhid and to keep distant from major shirk which eliminates tawhid when according to all scholars it is not permissible to delay the ilm of even the littlest matters of sharee'ah at times when the ilm is necessary?

From these explanations it should be clearly understood that the similarity of those who requested dhat anwaat was not the similarity in major shirk yet only the similarity of resembling the mushrik.

This is great slander and it is condemning the Nabi (saw) who Allah had chosen. The reason is, if this had been true how would it be possible that he ordered Muadh to go to an ahl kitab tribe, invite them to tawhid and until they recognise and know Allah completely not to teach them any other matter of sharee'ah. Complete recognition is such virtue that with it they would be able to distinguish between tawhid and shirk. He was to teach them their ilah which they did not have sufficient knowledge of. Did not RasulAllah also do this? Wa a'udhu billah. We keep our prophet (saw) distant from such deficiency and disgrace. On the contrary we would come across the following conclusion: surely most of the sahabah had died prior to learning the reality of tawhid and shirk before they matured with its ilm. Those who believe this must review their iman, abandon such belief and make tawbah. When he is questioned in the barzakh he will not be able to answer Allah he will only be able to say "I do not know! I

used to say what I heard the people saying!”.

It is certain that an individual will not have entered Islam in such state. As mentioned previously it is not permissible to delay any information regarding the furu of deen when it is needed. When the situation is as such regarding the furu how could it be possible to delay the restriction of shirk and the knowledge of tawhid which is the asl of deen. Would it be permissible to delay explaining it? **5- The Tribe of RasulAllah knowing the language of Arabic**

The Arabs of that time understood the reality of the deen from the phrase ‘La-ilaha illallah’, without a doubt, and only due to this reason Abu Jahl and all the kuffar had shown enmity against RasulAllah (saw) and his call. This phrase of ‘La-ilaha illallah’ is not limited with the meaning of ‘there is no deity other than Allah’ but it rebuked their worshipping others beside Allah. Abu Jahl and the mushrik society of the Arabian Peninsula during the era of RasulAllah (saw) similar to the Pharaoh and other society of shirk, knew that there is no creator other than Allah. Thus, there is no doubt that even before (or without) entering Islam, the people knew precisely that this is the first and most important change which Islam requires from them. So after entering Islam, this issue ought to be even clearer to them. How could they not know this when they were called as Muslims and surrounded by the other Sahabah who were in Islam since a longer time and RasulAllah (saw) himself was among them? If one claims that there is a possibility that the sahabah could not know this, then what will one embrace Islam with?

The tribe of RasulAllah (saw) knew the language the Qur’an had been revealed in very well. This is stable with the following ayah: "A Book, whereof the verses are explained in detail; a Qur'an in Arabic, for people who understand." (Fussilat 41/3)

Imam Baghawi stated: "a Qur'an in Arabic, for people who understand" (Fussilat 41/3) Meaning those who knew Arabic. If it had been in another language they would not have understood. Shawkani stated: "for people who understand" meaning they knew the meaning and would understand it. Likewise they had been fluent of the Arabic language.”

They knew and understood that which they had been called upon because they comprehended the Arab language. In this sense who ever fell into kufr from among them did it knowing the call of the Qur’an to the uluhiyyah of Allah and to reject ibadaah to any other than Allah. For this reason they said: “Has he made the gods (all) into one Allah?” (Sad 38/5); Again those among them which made iman, did it with knowledge.

Fundamentally the kuffar had known the call of RasulAllah (saw) and when it is like this, how could they have not understood what his intention was? As understood from all these their request (dhat anwaat) had not been from the types of major shirk yet it was only a request of similarity to the mushrik.

It is narrated from Anas (ra) that he said: RasulAllah (saw) said to a man: Embrace Islam. The man said: I dislike it. Thereupon RasulAllah (saw) said: Even if you dislike it.” (Ahmad) As seen clearly in this hadith RasulAllah (saw) ordered this man to enter Islam without having explained it to him before but the man

felt a dislike towards it and there is no doubt that the man felt this aversion because he had understood the true meaning of Islam, which contradicted his old religion. Hence, the man felt an uneasiness to leave his religion. It is undoubtedly clear that he knew the truth of Islam even before RasulAllah (saw) called him to that.

There is another narration which is narrated from al-Bara that: "A man in his armor came to RasulAllah (saw) and said: O RasulAllah! Shall I fight or embrace Islam first? RasulAllah (saw) said: Embrace Islam (first) and then fight. So he embraced Islam and was martyred. RasulAllah (saw) said: A little work but a great reward." (Bukhari) This man did not come in order to learn Islam he already knew Islam and that is why he did not say: O RasulAllah (saw) teach me Islam. Rather in his statement he meant to ask RasulAllah (saw) whether it would be better to fight first or to enter into Islam. RasulAllah (saw) did not demand from the man to enter the battle first like it is widespread nowadays among people but to enter into Islam first. RasulAllah (saw) knew that the man understood Islam and his teachings, therefore RasulAllah did not demand him to learn Islam first, but for him to enter Islam and then to fight for it. The hadith also implies that mere knowledge is not sufficient. One must have the will to enter into Islam and to publicly free oneself from all that which contradicts it. It is of no benefit if someone knows the true meaning of Islam and understands what Islam calls to until he accepts it, loves it, follows it and submits to Allah (swt).

The vast majority of the Arabs knew the meaning of Islam after the call of RasulAllah (saw) had become well-known. It is narrated from Jabir (ra) that he said: "RasulAllah (saw) stayed in Mecca for ten years he went to the people in their houses, at ukadh and majanna (marketplaces) and at the time of Hajj at Mina saying: "Who gives me shelter, who leads me to the victory, so that I can spread the Message of my Lord, he shall be granted Paradise. It was even said to those who came from Yemen or Mudar: "Watch out for the boy (i.e. RasulAllah) from Quraish that he does not lead you in temptation!" And RasulAllah (saw) walked between their riding animals, while they pointed at him with their fingers." (Ahmad, Musnad)

Shaikh Sulaiman ibn Abdullah stated: "Because the mushrik had understood what RasulAllah had called them upon they rejected to say 'La-ilaha illallah'. It is because as long as they worshipped lat, uzza and manat they would not be muslim by saying 'La-ilaha illallah' and RasulAllah (saw) would keep distant from them because of their associating partners to Allah and until they abandoned worshipping them, abandoning shirk and worshipping Allah the One god; he (saw) would fight them. This hukm is clearly known from the Qur'an, sunnah and the ijma of the scholars." (Taysirul Azizi'l-Hamid fi Sharhi Kitabu't-Tawhid, 58) **6- The situation of the individual who has the intention to sin**

Some will say that 'they (the requesters of dhat anwaat) had only made a request and had not performed the act'. Those who make such statement also try to claim that with this, their request was not shirk. This belief is a great mistake because the scholars had agreed regarding the fact that the one who intended to perform kufr will be kafir.

Allah (swt) commands: "Certainly those who have turned their backs on the True Guidance after it

became manifest to them, Satan has embellished their ways for them and has buoyed them up with false hopes. This, because they said to those who are averse to the faith that Allah has revealed: "In some matters we will obey you." (Muhammad 47/25-26) "Hast thou not observed the Hypocrites say to their misbelieving brethren among the People of the Book? - "If ye are expelled, we too will go out with you, and we will never hearken to any one in your affair; and if ye are attacked (in fight) we will help you". But Allah is witness that they are indeed liars." (al-Hashr 59/11)

The ulama have not differed in belief concerning the fact that the one who carries the intention of kufr in the future, disbelieves in the present. This is one of the principles of Takfir: "To intend to commit disbelief, even if in the future, and like this intention is hesitating whether to do so or not one thereby immediately commits disbelief." (Ibn Naqib, Umdat al-salik) "And if he says, 'If my son dies, I will convert to Judaism' or 'I will convert to Christianity' he disbelieves in the moment." (Taqiyyuddin Abi Bakr Ibn Muhammad Al-Husayni, Kifayat al-Akhyar Fi Halli Ghayat al-Ikhtisar, 2/123)

After narrating the hadith of dhat anwaat Abdurrahman ibn Hasan Alshaykh stated: "With the statement 'we had newly entered Islam' the Meccans who had recently become Muslim had been meant. Therefore contrary to those who had entered Islam before they did not know this act of theirs had been shirk" (Kuratu Uyuni Muwahiddeen, 74)

shaikh Sulaiman ibn Abdullah counts the following among the meaning which can be understood from dhat anwaat: 'The one who requests to perform an act of shirk will be restricted from this shirk and if he stops performing it; he will not be kafir.' (Taysiru'l Aziz al Hamid, 85)

From these statements one can never say that the one who performs shirk is excused and will not be made takfir of. What should be understood from these is the following: The individual who performs an act of shirk due to not knowing will be restricted from this, tawbah will be requested and if he makes tawbah, he will not be kafir. This explanation is the same as the statement of Muhammad ibn AbdulWahhab in Kashfu Shubuhat.

As the explanation of the statements in Kashfu Shuhubat Muhammad ibn AbdulWahhab also mentions the situation of the individual who makes tawbah after performing kufr. As an example for this he uses the incident of the banu Israil and dhat anwaat. This shows that he considers these acts as kufr. The statement that they had not become kafir means because they had immediately made tawbah the punishment of becoming murtad had not been given. Or else it does not mean that the performance of shirk is kufr yet the request of it is not.

Abu Hamzah al-Afghany in one of his works stated the following while ascribing it to the ulama of Najd: "The sahabah asked Allah for something they could worship besides Him. Without a doubt, one who asks for such a thing is a Mushrik and leaves this Deen, even if he is not aware of the error in his deed. For in reality such a person never even entered Islam, even if his Shirk was not apparent to the people before. So if one who wants to commit Shirk without knowing that Shirk is forbidden, such a person is a Mushrik and not a Muslim, as the clear proofs which were already mentioned before show. This would

mean that the sahabah who are referred to in the Hadith of Dhaatu Anwaat became mushrikeen, which is indeed possible according to the text in the Hadith. It must not necessarily be narrated that he (saw) called them to repent or said to them that they had left the deen or that they became mushrik. They however immediately took back their request, let alone following their request with deeds. According to this interpretation, they are exactly like those of Banu Israel. The sahabah were new in the Deen and therefore were not considered as becoming kuffar, who ought to be punished. The punishment of Kufr can only exist after the receipt of the evidences. This is what the scholars of the dawah Najdiyyah meant, such as Abd ur-Rahman ibnu Hassan in Fathu'l-Majeed" and Sulaimaan ibnu Abdillah in "Taisir il-Aziz il-Hamid". None of them ever claimed, not even once, that the sahabah were not Mushrikoon at the time of this request (because the sahabah did not know that this request contradicts the basis of Islam, even though this was not apparent until then. What they said was that the sahabah did not become kuffar (because they were ignorant, in other words they did not deny the Truth). The Juhaal however do not know the books of the scholars of dawah Najdiyyah apart from a few small parts which they are pleased with after they have interpreted them wrongly. The scholars of dawah Najdiyyah also used this Hadith in order to show that someone who makes such a request but does not however implement it as deeds, such a person remains Muslim and does not fall out of Islam as long as he immediately recognizes the Truth, accepts it and acts upon it (in this case, by abstaining from doing the action he asked to do). One does not speak here of overstepping the boundaries of Islam because the sahabah changed their opinion immediately, understood the correct Islam, accepted it and realized that they did not understand and accept it before. The scholars of the dawah Najdiyyah knew exactly that when one says to another, "Come, let us call this waliyullah for help (in matters which only Allah is capable of doing)", he immediately becomes a Mushrik due to the Shirk which is present in this statement and due to the Shirk which is present in his heart even if he ultimately does not carry out the deed which he intended to do. They knew these facts with certainty and anyone who reads their books will become sure of that."

First of all the ruling he is talking about is regarding those matters which are other than major kufr and major shirk. Allah (swt) commands:

"Allah forgiveth not that partners should be set up with Him; but He forgiveth anything else, to whom He pleaseth." (an-Nisa 4/48) "Whoever joins other gods with Allah, Allah will forbid him the garden, and the Fire will be his abode." (al-Maida 5/72) "Allah forgiveth not (The sin of) joining other gods with Him; but He forgiveth whom He pleaseth other sins than this." (an-Nisa 4/116) "But it has already been revealed to thee,- as it was to those before thee,- 'If thou wert to join (gods with Allah), truly fruitless will be thy work (in life), and thou wilt surely be in the ranks of those who lose (all spiritual good)'." (az-Zumar 39/65) "And whosoever of you turns back from his religion and dies as a disbeliever, then his deeds will be lost in this life and in the Hereafter, and they will be the dwellers of the Fire. They will abide therein forever." (al-Baqarah 2/217)

Had Allah taala made the non acceptance of shirk dependent on a condition? Is the shirk performed by the individual who is new in deen comprised in this ayah? Or is there another hukm which allots (takhsis) these ayah?

It is narrated on the authority of Abu Hurayrah (ra) and in another chain from Ibn Abbas (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) said: Allah (swt) said: Whenever my bondsman intends to do good, but does not do it, I write one good act for him, but if he puts it into practice I wrote from ten to seven hundred good deeds in favour of him. When he intends to commit an evil, but does not actually do it, do not record it. But if he does it, I write only one evil.” (Bukhari)

Anas b Malik (ra) narrated: “...He who intends to do a good deed and does not do it will have a good deed recorded for him; and if he does it, it will be recorded for him as ten; whereas he who intends to do an evil deed and does not do, it will not be recorded for him; and if he does it, only one evil deed will be recorded.”

Muslim collected the ahadith in the chapter ‘Allah disregards the premonition or the evil promptings of the heart so long as they do not take a firm root’ It is narrated on the authority of Abu Hurayrah that RasulAllah (saw) observed: Verily Allah forgave my people the evil promptings which arise within their hearts as long as they did not speak about them or did not act upon them. It is narrated on the authority of Abu Hurayrah that RasulAllah (saw) said: Verily Allah (swt) forgave my people the evil promptings arising in their minds, but they neither talked about them nor acted upon them. The same hadith has been narrated by Zuhair b. Harb, Waki, Ishaq b. Mansur, Husain b. 'Ali.

In the next chapter ‘Whenever a person intends to do a good deed, it is recorded but whenever he intends to commit evil, it is not written’ Muslim recorded the following ahadith: It is narrated on the authority of Abu Hurayrah (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) said: The Great and the Glorious Lord said (to angels): Whenever My bondsman intends to commit an evil, do not record it against him, but if he actually commits it, then write it as one evil. And when he intends to do good but does not do it, then take it down is one act of goodness, but if he does it, then write down ten good deeds (in his record). It is narrated on the authority of Abu Hurayrah (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) said: Allah (awj) said: Whenever my bondsman intends to do good, but does not do it, I write one good act for him, but if he puts it into practice I wrote from ten to seven hundred good deeds in favour of him. When he intends to commit an evil, but does not actually do it, do not record it. But if he does it, I write only one evil. Abu Hurayrah reported that Muhammad (saw) said: When it occurs to my bondsman that he should do a good deed but he actually does not do it, record one good to him, but if he puts it into practice, I make an entry of ten good acts in his favour. When it occurs to him to do evil, but he does not commit it, I forgive that. But if he commits it, I record one evil against his name. RasulAllah (saw) observed. The angels said: That bondsman of Yours intends to commit evil. though His Lord is more Vigilant than he. Upon this He (the Lord) said: Watch him; if he commits (evil), write it against his name but if he refrains from doing it, write one good deed or him, for he desisted from doing it for My sake. RasulAllah said: He who amongst you is good of faith, all his good acts are multiplied from ten to seven hundred times (and are recorded in his name) and all the evils that he commits are recorded as such (i, e. without increase) till he meets Allah. It is narrated on the authority of Abu Hurayrah (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) observed: He who intended to do good, but did not do it, one good was recorded for him, and he who intended to do good and also did it, ten to seven hundred good deeds were recorded for him. And he who intended evil, but

did not commit it, no entry was made against his name, but if he committed that, it was recorded. It is narrated on the authority of Ibn Abbas (ra) that RasulAllah (saw) transmitted it from the Blessed and Great Lord: Verily Allah recorded the good and the evil and then made it clear that he who intended good but did not do it, Allah recorded one complete good in his favour, but if he intended it and also did it, the Glorious and Great Allah recorded ten to seven hundred virtues and even more to his credit. But if he intended evil, but did not commit it, Allah wrote down full one good in his favour. If he intended that and also committed it, Allah made an entry of one evil against him. This hadith has been narrated with another chain of transmitters with the addition of these words: Allah would even wipe out (the evil committed by a man) and Allah does not put to destruction anyone except he who is doomed to destruction.” (Muslim) **i- Suggestion/prompting in iman and what should be said when it is occurs to the mind/heart of a man**

Secondly it is related with the explanation of ‘Pertaining to evil suggestion or prompting in faith and what should be said when it is occurs to the mind of a man’

It is narrated on the authority of Abu Hurayrah (ra) that some people from amongst the Companions of RasulAllah (saw) came to him and said: Verily we perceive in our minds that which every one of us considers it too grave to express. He (saw) said: Do you really perceive it? They said: Yes. Upon this he remarked: That is the faith manifest. The same hadith has been transmitted by Muhammad b. 'Amr, Abu Baker b. Ishaq, Abu'l-Jawwab, A'mash and Abu Hurayrah. It is narrated on the authority of 'Abdullah b. Mas'ud that RasulAllah (saw) was asked about evil prompting, to which he replied: It is pure faith.

Shaitan pesters the believers with such promptings as are against iman. There are times that unnecessary questions are suggested and people think about them and ask silly questions which go against the iman. With these prompting and suggestions they even wonder who created Allah (swt). It is generally the Believers who get these thoughts (passing but unconfirmed thoughts) because they have faith and shaitan is an enemy of iman. His attacks with promptings are directed only at the Believers and they are so evil that a believing person is repulsed and cannot speak them out at any cost. Even if he is given the entire world, he cannot agree to bring it out on his tongue or believe it. Even if Muslims are burnt down to ashes, they cannot compromise themselves to speak the evil feelings in their minds/hearts. Muslims are not responsible with getting such thoughts, and should seek refuge in Allah from the accused shaitan. This issue is addressed in the ayah: ‘Whether you show what is in your minds or conceal it.’ (al-Baqarah 2/284)

Abu Hurayrah (ra) said that when this verse was revealed, sahabah (ra) got extremely sad and fearful that they would be accounted by Allah (awj) for everything including their inner thoughts. They went to RasulAllah (saw), got down on their knees and said, “O RasulAllah! Allah (swt) has so far prescribed for us things that we can bear doing, such as prayer, fasting, jihaad, and zakah. But with regard to this verse, we would not be able to abide by the teaching it

denotes.” RasulAllah (saw) said, “Do you want to follow in the footsteps of the ahl-kitaab before you, when they said (to their Prophets), ‘We hear, but we rebel’? You should, rather, say, ‘We hear, and we obey. (Grant us) Thy forgiveness, our Lord. Unto Thee is the journeying.’” Upon that, the sahabah submitted humbly to what Allah ordains in that verse. Following this, Allah (jj) revealed in the verse what means: ‘The Messenger believes in what has been revealed to him from his Lord, and (so do) the believers; they all believe in Allah and His angels and His books and His messengers; We make no difference between any of His messengers; and they say: We hear and obey, our Lord! Thy forgiveness (do we crave), and to Thee is the eventual course.’ (Al-Baqarah 2/285) And then, Allah (swt) revealed the verse which gives the meaning of: ‘Allah does not impose upon any soul a duty but to the extent of its ability; for it is (the benefit of) what it has earned and upon it (the evil of) what it has wrought: Our Lord! do not punish us if we forget or make a mistake; Our Lord! do not lay on us a burden as Thou didst lay on those before us, Our Lord do not impose upon us that which we have not the strength to bear; and pardon us and grant us protection and have mercy on us, Thou art our Patron, so help us against the unbelieving people.’ (al-Baqarah 2/286)” (Ahmad)

There are many ahadith reported in that regard. This indicates that Allah (awj) revealed the verse in question as a trial to test the faith and submission of the Prophet’s Companions, and they proved to be up to Almighty Allah’s trust in them. Hence, He Almighty, out of His Graciousness and Mercy, alleviated their worry and decreed that they would not be accountable for what they harbored in their hearts.

It was narrated that Abu Hurayrah (ra) said: “Some of the companions of RasulAllah (saw) came to RasulAllah (saw) and said to him, ‘We find in ourselves thoughts that are too terrible to speak of.’ He said, ‘Are you really suffering from that?’ They said, ‘Yes.’ He said, ‘That is a clear sign of faith.’” (Muslim).

It was narrated in Sahihayn, also from Abu Hurayrah, that RasulAllah (saw) said, “The Shaitan comes to one of you and says, ‘Who created such and such? Who created such and such?’ until he says, ‘Who created your Lord?!’ If that happens to any of you, let him seek refuge with Allah and put a stop to these thoughts.” (Bukhari; Muslim)

It was narrated from Ibn Abbas (ra) that a man came to RasulAllah (saw) and said, “I think thoughts to myself, which I would rather be burnt to a cinder than speak of them.” RasulAllah (saw) said, “Praise be to Allah, Who has reduced all his (the Shaitan’s) plots to mere whispers.” (Abu Dawud)

Sheikhul Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) said: “The believer may suffer from the whispers of the Shaitan insinuating thoughts of kufr, which may make him feel distressed. The Sahabah said, ‘O RasulAllah, some of us think thoughts which we would rather fall from heaven to earth than

‘speak of them.’ He said, ‘That is a clear sign of faith.’ According to one report, ‘... thoughts which are too terrible to speak of.’ He said, ‘Praise be to Allah, Who has reduced all his [the Shaitan’s] plots to mere whispers,’ meaning that the fact that these whispers come, but they are so greatly disliked, and they are pushed away from the heart, is a clear sign of faith. This is like the mujaahid to whom the enemy comes, but he resists him until he overwhelms him, and this is a mighty jihaad... Hence the seekers of knowledge and devoted worshippers experience waswaas and doubts which others do not face, because they (the others) are not following the way prescribed by Allah, rather they are following their own whims and desires and neglecting to remember their Lord. This is what the Shaitan wants, in contrast to those who are striving to draw closer to their Lord by seeking knowledge and worshipping Him. He is their enemy and seeks to prevent them from drawing closer to Allah.” (Kitaab al-Iman, 147)

If a Muslim is faced with this waswaas from the Shaitan, then he should fight it and resist it. Surely it can never harm a Muslim when he fulfils the duty of fighting and resisting it, and he refuses to be controlled by it. RasulAllah (saw) said, “Allah will forgive my ummah for any insinuating whispers that may cross their minds, so long as they do not act upon it or speak of it.” (Bukhari; Muslim)

When a Muslim is faced with this waswaas from the Shaitan, he should question himself and ask: Do I believe the insinuating whispers I experience? Do I think that they are true? Do I really think that Allah is like what this waswaas says? And should respond himself by stating the statement of Allah, “It is not right for us to speak of this. Glory be to You (O Allah)! This is a great lie” (an-Nur 24/16). He would denounce that in his heart and with his tongue, and be the one who objects to it the most, for it is only whispers and thoughts that cross his mind. It is a trap set by the Shaytaan, who flows through the son of Adam like blood flows, to make you doomed and to confuse him about his religion.

Hence he will find that the Shaitan does not cast doubts or suspicions into his heart about trivial matters. For example, he may hear of the existence of great cities filled with people and buildings in the east and the west, but it would never cross his mind some day to doubt that they exist or to criticize them and say that they are in ruins and unfit for habitation, or that they are uninhabited, and so on. The Shaitan has nothing to gain by making people doubt about these cities. But he does have a lot to gain by corrupting the believer’s faith, so he strives with his cavalry and his infantry to extinguish the light of knowledge and guidance in his heart and to make him fall into the darkness of doubt and confusion. RasulAllah (saw) has told us of the appropriate remedy for that, which is to seek refuge with Allah and put a stop to it. If a person puts a stop to that and continues to worship Allah, seeking and hoping for (the reward) which is with Allah, that will stop by Allah’s leave. So we should turn away from all the thoughts of this kind that cross ones mind.

ii- Thoughts can be divided into different categories

Our thoughts can be divided into different categories: The first category is the constant self-talk or idle thoughts that assail our minds and over which we have no control. We are not accountable for this stage since we have no control over it, unless we dwell on the thoughts and nurture them in our minds. We are accountable if we dwell on them. We are also accountable for the deliberate intentions that we formulate based on these thoughts.

The second category is the thoughts that we dwell on. The other category includes the intentions that we formulate based on those thoughts. When we dwell on the thoughts which come across our minds without our ikhtiyar, at this point responsibility of mankind starts. If we built upon an intention over the thoughts that we dwelled, then we are responsible for these types of thoughts. Allah (awj) would forgive the slave who had intention of evil thoughts as long as he does not act upon or speak out. Allah (awj) does not account a person for his thoughts except in two cases:

First, if a person has firm determination to put into practice the thought in his mind. The evidence for this is the hadith regarding two Muslims who meet each other with their swords. RasulAllah (saw) said: "If two Muslims meet each other with their swords, then (both) the killer and the killed one are in Hellfire." I (the narrator) said, "O RasulAllah! It is all right for the killer, but what about the killed one?" He said, "The killed one was eager to kill his opponent." (Bukhari; Muslim) Second, once the person applies what he thinks of. A person is accountable for his intention to do an evil deed that he couldn't carry out due to inability or fear of authorities. But if he couldn't carry it out due to piety and fear of Allah, then Allah would not account him for it. Instead, he may attain the reward of Jihaad an-nafs; striving against inner whims.

Ibn Hajar stated the following on the explanation of the hadith which is narrated from Ibn Abbas (ra) by Bukhari: 'When he intends to commit an evil, but does not actually do it, Allah would command to be written a good deed for him.' Hattabi stated: The reward for abandoning the performance of an evil thought is dependent on the condition that the individual who had that evil thought is capable of performing it and that he has abandoned it. The reason is because an individual will only be considered to have abandoned something if he had not done it while he was capable of doing it. A prevention coming between the individual and the will to perform the evil thought is also included. For instance if an individual goes to a female to perform fornication and if he finds the door closed and does not open it he will not be accounted to have abandoned fornication. In the same sense if an individual finds the means of fornicating yet can not get erect or in the short term a situation that will harm him appears, this individual will not be considered to have abandoned fornication. 'But if he does it, I write only one evil.' The hadith mentioned in Muslim narrated by Abu Dhar Allah taala had commanded 'And he who comes with vice' it is only for that that he is called to account. I even forgive him as I like' The meaning of this is that Allah taala will delete that evil with his blessing or with tawbah or with istighfar or with the performance of a good deed which will eliminate and the evil one. Due to the dhahir of the hadith narrated by Abu Dhar the first one to occur is a greater possibility. The hadith is in the meaning of rejection to the claim that great sins will only be forgiven with tawbah." (Fathu'l-Bari, Kitab al-Riqaq,

12/602-603)

Ibn Taymiyyah stated regarding the hadith "Allah has forgiven my ummah for whatever crosses their mind so long as they do not speak of it or act upon it." (Bukhari; Muslim) To forgive what goes on with the nafs is valid for the ummah of Muhammad (saw) who believes in Allah, His angels, His books, His envoys and the day of judgement. Surely it is known that this forgiving will be in situations which do not harm the iman. When it comes to the situations which harm the iman the hadith does not comprise things as such. It is because when these nullify the iman the doer is no longer a part from the ummah of Muhammad (saw). He takes the degree of the munafiq. Therefore it is not necessary he be forgiven for the words that cross his mind and his actions. That which this hadith points to is an open difference. Likewise the evidences of the sharee'ah all come together in this sense. This is just like Allah forgiving the mistake and forgetting from this ummah of those which the book and sunnah point out. According to this whomsoever has the right iman, his mistake and forgetfulness and those that cross his mind are forgiven. Just like they will be taken out of jahannam. This is contrary to the one who does not have an iman. Surely the nass does not show that an individual as such is not held responsible for those that cross his mind, his mistake and his sin." (Fatawa 10/760)

This explanation of Ibn Taymiyyah clearly shows that the individual who will benefit from the permits of the ahl qiblah must have a sahih iman and that forgiveness is actualised only in situations which do not nullify the iman. When it comes to the kafir mushrik and the individual who is from the ahl qiblah but has wrecked his iman this means that the hadith does not comprise them. **7- Did the ulama of Najd call it major kufr?**

Among the reliable scholars none of them evaluate the incident of dhat anwaat as major shirk. The only group of people who consider this incident to be major shirk is today's 'ghulat murji'ah' the seemingly salafi. In order to find examples of these it would be sufficient to just look into their sources in which they try to prove their non-takfir theories. As seen in the statement of Shatibi mentioned above, the people of dhat anwaat did not resemble the banu Isra'il of the era of Musa in the sense of requesting a deity. Also in order to caution individuals from minor shirk relying on examples of major shirk are what RasulAllah, the sahabah and those who submitted to them did repeatedly.

The ulama of Najd used the principle of 'Condemning the major shirk as inclusive of the lesser' to explain this incident.

"Ibn Abu Hatim reported from Hudhaifah that RasulAllah (saw) saw a man carrying a garment which he claimed protected him against fever; that he tore it to pieces recalling the verse: '.....Most of them believe in Allah and still practice shirk'. (Yusuf 12/106) After narrating this Muhammad b Abdulwahab commented: "That the hadith of Hudhaifah is evidence that the companions resorted to the verses dealing with the greater shirk to condemn the lesser, as Ibn Abbas had done when he resorted to the verse from surah al-Baqarah." (Kitab'ut Tawhid Babu min'ash-shirki labsil halkati wa'l hayti li raf'il balai wa daf'ih) Regarding the verse from surah al-Baqarah he said: "Therefore, do not knowingly set up equal associates (Andad) to Allah." (al-Baqarah 2/22) Ibn Hatim related that in regard to this verse, Ibn

Abbas (ra) said:” ‘Andad' constitutes shirk. It is a crime less detectable than the crawling of ants on a black surface at night. It is to fall into it to say, even casually, to your friend, 'By Allah, by your life, O friend' or 'By my life! etc; or 'where it not for our little dog' or 'the ducks in our yard, the thieves would have broken through [the house]!' or 'were it not for Allah and you, O Friend,' etc. Do not mention anybody with Allah, if you want to avoid shirk.” After this explanation Muhammad b Abdulwahab comments: “The Companions understood the verse condemning the greater shirk as inclusive of the lesser.” (Kitab’ut Tawhid)

“Hudhaifah (ra) cut a thread that was held by a man, then he recited Allah's Statement: ‘And most of them believe not in Allah except that they attribute partners unto Him (i.e. they are Mushrikun)’ (Yusuf, 106) (Compiled by Ibn Abu Hatim)” Then he commented: “The Prophet's companions found a proof in the Qur'anic verses pertaining to the Major Shirk on the Minor Shirk as well.” (Fathu’l-Majid)

Abdurrahman ibn Hasan stated the following in Fathul Majeed: “From this we could understand that the ayah Allah revealed regarding major shirk could be brought as evidence for minor shirk. The reason is (minor shirk) since it is included within the name of shirk and if the ayah is regarding shirk then the ayah will encompass it (minor shirk) also. In the statements of Shaikhul Islam and others the tafsir of Ibn Abbas and others regarding this ayah had previously been mentioned.” (Fathul Majeed)

“In the Hadith we read: ‘What I fear most for you is lesser Shirk. When asked what it is, RasulAllah (saw) answered, Hypocrisy.’ This shows RasulAllah's mercy and pity for his ummah as he left no good but he guided them to it, and he left no evil but he warned them against it. RasulAllah (saw) says: ‘There is no Prophet whom was sent by Allah but it was a duty on him to guide his ummah to the best of what he knows.’ So, if lesser Shirk was feared pertaining to the Prophet's companions (ra) while they were of perfect knowledge and strong faith, how could it not be (feared) by those who are much less than they in terms of knowledge and faith! This is especially so, if it becomes known that most scholars at this present time do not fully realize the significance, importance and essence of tawhid.” (Fathu’l-Majeed)

In summary there is no reality in claiming those who requested dhat anwaat had been kafir. The reason is in the hadith there is no sign that those who requested dhat anwaat were made takfir of. For this reason, claiming that this incident can be evaluated as major shirk must only be an excuse for the murjiah in order to be able to falsely prove that ignorance can be excused in asluddeen.

If one is to say if this request of the sahabah was not major shirk then why did RasulAllah react and say “Allahu akbar! What you have said is like what the Bani Israil had said to Musa “Make for us an ilah (a god) as they have an ilah (gods)” (al-Araf 7/138). The answer to this will be: first of all the reaction of RasulAllah does not prove that this act was major shirk. Hence in order to caution people from things that are minor shirk, giving examples of major shirk or to react as if that incident is like major shirk is a type of genre used by RasulAllah and even the sahabah, often done to bring attention to how important the matter is. Likewise RasulAllah had answered the individual who said “If Allah and you will” with “Do you appoint me as partner to Allah”. When Hudhaifah had gone into the room of an ill person and seen a belt on his arm (a piece of leather) he ripped it off and recited ‘.....Most of them believe in Allah and

still practice shirk'. (Yusuf 12/106) (Tafsiru Qur'anil Azim, 4/418; Tafsiru Ibn-i Abi Hatim, 8/473)

Ibn Abbas had recited the ayah as evidence to minor shirk. Regarding the evidence Hudhaifah used Muhammad ibn AbdulWahhab stated "the sahabah had made tafsir of those ayah which had been revealed for major shirk for minor shirk also".

Along with this RasulAllah saying of their resembling the request of dhat anwaat to the request of the bani israil from Musa is not sarih evidence that their request had been major shirk. Hence a complete conformity is not mentionable in comparing the one that resembles and the one that is compared with. When we say "he is like a lion" we resemble our acquaintance to a lion in strength or nobility not in totality. For this reason RasulAllah resembling the request of the sahabah to the request of the banu isra'il does not prove it is in major shirk for certain. Surely Allah knows best. **i- Did Muhammad ibn AbdulWahab excuse the sahabah because they did not act upon their request?**

Muhammad b Abdulwahab described in 'Kasf al-Shubuhah', the situation of a Muslim who commits shirk inadvertently and repents right after: "The modern mushrik argue that neither Banu Isra'il nor the sahabah in question had actually achieved their requests, another god in one case and another Dhat Anwaat in the second. Hence they did not actually commit unbelief. (Our response for this doubt is) It is certainly true that neither of them got what they wanted; that had they obtained what they sought, their unbelief would have been confirmed in the deed. These anachodetes teach us that the Muslim, even if he were steeped in knowledge, might well fall into shirk inadvertently. They have the merit of reminding us not to take tawhid simplistically. Self-conceit in such matters constitutes great ignorance and greater temptation. Should the Muslim pronounce words comprising the tawhid, he should be so told; and he should repent and withdraw his words, just as the sahabah did. Just so, however he has deserved some chastening as RasulAllah did to sahabah." (Kasf al-Shubuhah)

As seen Muhammed ibn Abdulwahhab mentions the situation of the individual who makes tawbah. As an example he mentions the incident of the Banu Isra'il and Dhat Anwaat. This shows that he considers the actions performed here to be kufr. The statement they did not become kafir is in the sense that since they had made tawbah immediately they did not receive the punishment of being murtad. Or else the meaning performance of shirk is kufr but the request of it is not, is certainly not established. While Muhammad ibn Abdulwahhab states because these individuals had made tawbah immediately after their mistake they had not been made takfir of, meaning their blood had not been considered permissible, jihadis such as Abdulqadir ibn Abdulaziz and the murjiyah claim the sahabah had not been made takfir due to their ignorance. Whereas in the statements of Abdulwahhab there is no excuse such as ignorance brought to attention.

Mujaddid Imam Muhammad ibn Abdulwahab in Kitabul Tawhid stated:

“6. That they have more desert to their credit and promise of mercy and forgiveness.

11. That shirk does admit of degrees, for they remained Muslims despite their deed.” (Babu min tabarruku bi shajarin aw hajarin wa nahwaha)

Those who carefully read the statements of the shaikh will comprehend that the sahabah had not requested blessings from the tree itself but from Allah through the blessing Allah would give through the tree; this is minor shirk and it is in a way resemblance to the mushrik. He stated: “6. desert to their credit and promise of mercy and forgiveness” it is known that it can not be said that in major shirk, Allah will forgive through the kafarrah of the amal. In the eleventh issue, it is seen that the shirk is divided in two sections. One being major shirk which is the request directly from the tree and the second being minor shirk which is the request from Allah to receive blessings through the tree. He had also included that the sahabah had not become murtad. It is known that the shirk which does not take one out of the fold of Islam is minor shirk and not major shirk. Both these issues clearly show that the view of the shaikh is that the sahabah had committed minor shirk and not major shirk.

ii- Dhat Anwaat was a way to major shirk

Shaikh Abdurrahman b Hasan b Muhammad b Abdulwahab said the following in his book ‘Fathu’l-Majeed sharhi Kitabu’t-Tawhid’ under the chapter ‘Asking the Blessings of a Tree or a Stone’: “Allah (awj) says, ‘Have you then considered Al-Lat and Al-'Uzza (two idols of the pagan Arabs). And Manat (another idol of the pagan Arabs), the other third?’ (An-Najm 19-20) Narrated Abu Waqid Al-Laithi: ‘We set out in the company of RasulAllah (saw) towards Hunaiyn while we have recently embraced Islam. There, we saw a lote-tree which the polytheists used to worship and hang their arms. It was called Dhat Anwaat. Afterwards, we passed by (another) lote-tree and we said: O RasulAllah! Let's have a Dhat Anwaat (a sacred lote-tree) as they (i.e. the polytheists) have one. RasulAllah (saw) said: Allah is the Greatest! These are the ways! By Him in Whose Hand my soul is! You said the same as have been said by the Children of Israel to Musa (as): ‘Make for us an ilah (a god) as they have an ilah (gods). He said: Verily, you are a people who know not (the Majesty and Greatness of Allah and what is obligatory upon you, i.e. to worship none but Allah Alone, the One and the Only God of all that exists)’. (Al-Araf 7/138) You would follow the ways of those who came before you.” (Tirmidhi) The saying: "Narrated Abu Waqid," i.e. Harith Ibn Awf. He was a well-known Companion of Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings be upon him) who died in 68 A.H. at the age of 58 years. The saying: "We set out in the company of Allah's Messenger (peace and blessings be upon him) towards Hunaiyn," In "Amr Ibn 'Awfs Hadith, "We set out on Jihaad with Allah's Messenger (peace and blessings be upon him) in the year of Al-Fat'h. We were more than one thousand until we reached a place between Hunain and Al-Ta'if...etc." The saying: "While we have recently embraced Islam," i.e. we have just left Shirk to Islam. This shows that such persons who have just given up Shirk recently fear that some of these unjust habits may still dwell in their hearts. About the saying that reads, "There we saw a lote-tree to which the polytheists used to be devoted," i.e. they used to stay by it for long periods of time. Prophet Ibrahim (as) mentioned

the term "devotion" in the verse, {What are these images, to which you are devoted?}. The polytheists' devotion to this lote-tree was meant to seeking its blessings and to glorify it. In Amr's Hadith "The people used to hang their weapons on it. Therefore it was called dhat Anwaat." The words, "And hang their weapons," i.e. hang them there to be blessed by that lote-tree. It is evident that their worship took three forms: glorification, devotion and seeking blessings; trees and the like used to be worshipped that way (with these three forms of worship). The words, "We said: O Allah's Messenger! Let's have a Dhat Anwaat (a sacred lote-tree," Abu Al-Saadat said: They asked him to make a god tree like that one but he (peace and blessings be upon him) rebuked them. They thought their worship of the tree would please Allah and so it was their intention. They were not so foolish as to desire to oppose the Prophet (saw). "RasulAllah (saw) said: 'Allah is the Greatest,' and in another version, he said: 'Glorified be Allah.' This phrase intends Allah's glorification over and above all and any kind of Shirk (polytheism) through worshipping or glorifying any one other than Him (Glorified be He). The Prophet (saw) used to utter some words of Takbir (exaltation) and Tasbih (glorification) as a form of exclamation in case he heard someone utter the statement related to Allah's Divinity or Deity. "These are the ways," i.e. paths or ways. "By Him in Whose Hand my soul is! You said the same as has been said by the Children of Israel to Musa: Make for us an ilah (a god) as they have alihah (gods)," their request is compared to the request of the Banu Isra'il since they both asked for a god to worship other than Allah. Though the words are different, the intention is the same, for changing certain words doesn't necessarily result in changing the fact. The above quotation warns against shirk: A man may admire something thinking it will make him close to Allah while in fact it ousts him from His Mercy. Actually, one can not grasp the meaning unless he has a look at what many scholars and grave worshippers commit, i.e. over devotion thinking they are on the right path while they did a fatal and unforgivable sin. Al-Hafiz Abu Muhammad "Abdur Rahman Ibn Isma'il Ash-Shafi'i, known as Ibn Abu Shamah, in his book "Al-Bida wal Hawadith" Heresies and Incidents, said: Related to this issue is what prevails nowadays i.e. the shaitan seduces people to create figures and forms on the walls and pillars. Certain places in every country are distinctively lighted. Someone may tell his fellows that he had seen some pious believers adhering to this heresy or that. Consequently, people may follow him and keep doing the same and at the same time waste Allah's duties and obligations. They think they are doing something that pleases Allah. They even go beyond this to the extent that they may be seduced to glorify these places in their hearts which they actually do. They may make a vow to them to cure their patients or satisfy their needs while they are nothing but springs of water, trees, walls or stones. For example, Damascus has a number of similar places like the small spring of Hima outside the Toma Gate, the Illustrated Pillar inside As-Saghir Gate and the Damned Tree outside An-Nasr Gate in the same road. We ask Allah help to cut down it from its roots as it is similar to Dhat Anwaat mentioned in the Hadith. Ibn Al-Qayim (ra) mentioned something similar to Abu Shaman's, then he said: The polytheists hurry to worship idols and not Allah whatever they are. They say this stone, tree or spring accepts our vows, in other words, it deserves worshipping, and not Allah. Since making vows is a form of worship intended to make the one who makes it closer to the intended one or object. More details about this issue will be dealt with later while tackling the Prophet's saying "O Allah! Don't let my grave be taken as an idol to be worshipped." Lessons to be derived from this statement: What is done by those who worship these trees, graves and stones such as seeking their blessings, devotion and sacrificing is no less than shirk. We mustn't be deceived or misled by the common or the wicked people. Moreover, we shouldn't think that shirk is unlikely to prevail in our Ummah. Some

Companions of RasulAllah (saw) thought this matter to be a good deed so they requested it from RasulAllah (saw) but he directed their attention to the fact that it was exactly what the Children of Israel said. {Make for us an ilah (a god) as they have alihah (gods)}. (Al-A'raf: 138) If that was the case with the Prophet's Companions, how would it be like with those who are less than them in knowledge and grace. Moreover, they are subject to ignorance and the effect of the remote era of the era of the Prophecy. Therefore, they are ignorant of the most obvious forms of shirk in Lordship that they glorified their idols and thought it would be the best way to gain Allah's Pleasure. One of the conclusions derived from the above is that what really matters is meaning and sense not words. Therefore, the Prophet (saw) compared their request to that of the Children of Israel. He did not pay attention to the fact that they called their idol 'Dhat Anwaat' since a polytheist is a polytheist regardless of what names he may call his shirk. The same thing applies to whoever calls the invocation, sacrifice and making vows, etc, to the dead, some sort of glorification and love. This is exactly Shirk regardless of whatever names are used. The same also applies to similar situations. "You would follow the ways of those who came before you," i.e. paths and methods. This is true as one can feel from what really happens to our Ummah. The Hadith is a clear-cut evidence of the authenticity of Muhammad's Prophethood since what the Prophet (saw) said, happened actually later. The Hadith also warns against imitating the polytheists and the People of the Scripture unless what they do proves that it is in accordance with the Law of Muhammad (saw). The Hadith sheds some light on issues of the graves through answering the three questions raised in the grave: Who is your Lord? The answer is clear. Who is your Prophet? This is also clear. As for: What is your religion? It is indicated in their request to make an ilah for them as others have, etc. The Hadith also indicates that Shirk must take place in this Ummah even though some deny it. It also highlights the Prophet's indignation while he was educating his Companion. Finally, Allah taala informs us of the bad qualities he detests in the Jews and Christians so as to warn us against them. Some recent people claim that it is permissible to seek the blessings through the remains of some pious dead persons. However, this is strictly prohibited in many ways. For example, the pioneer Companions and their successors did not do that with anyone except the Prophet (saw) not during his life or after his death. If that had been a good thing, no doubt, they would have done it before us, Moreover, we do not know any Companion or Follower to have done a thing like that even with the best of all the Prophet's Companions such as Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and Ali (ra) whom the Prophet (saw) affirmed they were among the Dwellers of Paradise, nor did the Followers who came after them with their master scholars in knowledge or religion. Therefore, no analogy can be done between the Prophet (saw) and any of the Ummah since the Prophet (saw) had a number of privileges that nobody should share with him." (Fathu'l-Majeed) **i- The Hadith regarding the man who ordered his sons to burn and scatter his ashes after his death**

There are three views that are mentioned regarding the hadith known as the 'hadith of the ashes' or 'the hadith of qudrah'. The first among these is the claim that is represented by those who carry the closest views to today's murjiyah who claim that although this individual who is mentioned in the hadith had performed kufr in asluddeen he had been forgiven and thus for this reason ignorance is an acceptable excuse for each individual. They stated: "As will be seen in the hadith this man did not know Allah was capable of resurrecting him. However regardless of this Allah forgave him. This is evidence that ignorance can be excused. For the reason that those who commit shirk to Allah today are ignorant they are excused due to this ignorance."

The second view is the views of individuals such as Abdulqadir ibn Abdulaziz Makdisi, Abu Basir, Abu Hamza al-Misri whom represents the jihaadi movement. These individuals claim that although the individual mentioned in the hadith had performed kufr in asluddeen he had been excused and they claim that ignorance was not a general excuse in the principle of asluddeen however being new in Islam, not having sufficient time to have learnt sahih 'ilm, to live distant from people such as in mountains or deserts and simply not being able to attain 'ilm can be an excuse for some individuals in exceptional circumstances.

Regarding this matter in recent times, there has emerged other views claimed by some individuals. Those who carry this belief, have built their theory upon conspiracy. In summary they claim that regarding the sources of the scholars who claim that "the man mentioned in the hadith had not performed kufr in asluddeen; under some conditions which ignorance can be an excuse he had been mistaken regarding the attributes of Allah and for this reason his ignorance had been accepted as an excuse" this section in the sources and books regarding this man in the hadith had been added and fabricated (in all the sources) by the Saudi Talafy in order to spread the belief that ignorance can be an excuse.

The first two claims which are brought forward have been built upon distorting the evidence and by going outside of the meaning of what the scholars had stated. The third view does not rely on any 'ilm of sharee'ah or on any evidence, on the contrary it is merely built upon theories.

We will inshaAllah quote the views of the ulama and establish the correct view with proper evidence inshaAllah. Prior to this we would like to say the following regarding the last view concerning this matter which had been claimed and has no coherency:

This claim is a newly-invented view which none of the scholars, nor any of the leading linguists, have ever advocated; rather the words of the scholars and linguists are apparent. This attitude reminds us of the situation which is described in the following hadith: Abu Hurayrah (ra) narrated that RasulAllah (saw) said: "At the end of time, there will be liars and fabricators. They will come to you with narrations that neither you nor your fathers will have heard. So, let you and them (i.e. your fathers) beware that they do not misguide you or tempt you." (Muslim; Ibn Hibban, Sahih; Ahmad, Musnad; Hakim, Mustadrak; Abu Ya'la, Musnad)

This new attack is disguised as an innocent and sincere attempt to seek the truth, while in reality it aims to target one of the indispensable sources of Islam upon which Muslims rely on to understand their religion, i.e. the books of the ulama. They aim to plant doubts in a Muslim's heart about the authenticity of the books of ulama.

One of the most distinguishing characteristic of the people of analogy and opinion is spending their time to find/give fatwas about incidents which have not actually occurred but only the situations of that which is imagined. They deem to earn some benefit with this, namely deriving more rulings in case these

problems happened. They use their intellect to invent new problems. When their examples are objected to it would be easily seen that they waste their time with ridiculous examples and impossible incidents such as if a fish led salah prayer, would it be accepted. Instead of seeking the beneficial 'ilm they keep themselves busy with hypothetical cases. In the course of deducing the reasons behind rulings established by the Qur'an and the Sunnah, they theorize situations in order to assert the causes for the rulings and apply them.

There was an incident of Imam Abu Hanifah when he saw a man who was so quiet and looked really religious. So out of respect for him, Abu Hanifah did not extend his leg in his direction. The man asked: "If the sun comes up before fajr time, when should we fast?" Imam responded by saying, "It's time to extend my leg." out towards him.

Muhammad ibn al-Munkadir reported that Jabir prayed wearing only an izar (lower garment wrapped around the waist) tied at the back [the reason for this is that they did not have trousers, and they would wear their izar tied at the back because this was more concealing when they did ruku and sujud. (Fathu'l-Bari, 1/467) and his other clothes were on a clothes hook. Someone said to him, 'Are you praying in one garment?' He said, 'I only did it so that some foolish person like you would see me. Who among us had two garments at the time of RasulAllah (saw)?' (Bukhari). Ibn Hajar said: "What is meant by 'foolish' here is 'ignorant' ... The purpose was to explain that it is permissible to pray wearing only one garment, although wearing two garments is preferable. It is as if he was saying, 'I did it on purpose to show that it is permissible, so that one who does not know could follow me in that or he could rebuke me so that I could teach him that it is permissible.' The reason why his answer was so harsh was so that he could teach them not to rebuke the scholars and to urge them to look into shar'i matters themselves." (al-Fath, 1/467)

The virtue of the scholar over the worshipper is like the virtue of the moon over all of the stars, for the ulamaa are the inheritors of the Prophets. The Prophets neither bequeath the dinar nor the dirham rather they bequeath knowledge. So whoever takes hold of it has acquired a great fortune." Tirmidhi reported from a hadith of Abu Umamah al-Bahili (ra) that he said: RasulAllah (saw) mentioned two men: one who was a worshipper and the other who was a scholar, he then mentioned who had more virtue, "The virtue of the scholar over the worshipper is like the virtue of me over the least of you..." Allah specified the ulamaa over the rest of the believers and favoured them, teaching them the Book and the Hikmah and giving them understanding of the deen and of the correct interpretations. So Allah favoured them over the rest of the believers throughout all times and epochs. He raised them with knowledge and adorned them with hilm. By them (the ulamaa), the halaal is known from the haraam, the haq is known from the baatil, the harmful is known from the beneficial, and the good from the bad. Their virtue is great and so is their (potential) danger. They are the inheritors of the Prophets and the coolness of the eyes of the Righteous. Even the fish in the sea seek forgiveness for them and the angels spread out their wings over them in humility. On the Day of Judgment, the ulamaa will be after the Prophets in intercession. Their gatherings bring wisdom and their actions admonish the people who are heedless. They are the most virtuous of the servants and they have the highest station of the zuhhd. Their lives are enriched and their deaths are a calamity. They remind the heedless and they teach the ignorant.

With their good manners they humble the defamers and with the beauty of their admonishment they bring back the negligent. All of their knowledge is needed and the correct (answers) to those who oppose them are also needed, obeying them with all good characteristics is obligatory and disobeying them is a sin. Whoever obeys them is guided and whoever disobeys them has been stubborn. They are the torch of the servants ('ibad) and the light of the lands (bilad), and they are responsible for the Ummah. They bring about wisdom, they resist Shaytan and they cause the hearts of the people of truth to be enlivened and the hearts of the people of deviation to die. Their likeness in the earth is like the stars in the heavens which are used as guides in the darkness of the land and at sea... (Imam al-Ajurri, Akhlaqu'l-ulamaa, 33-35)

Our 'ulamaa' said, "Who will be followed after them among the Imams who are the pillars of the religion and the supports of the Shari`ah, those who advise the slaves of Allah and guide those who are right-guided to Allah? **1- The hadith**

Abu Hurayrah (ra) reported RasulAllah (saw) as saying that "A person who had never done any good deed asked the members of his family to burn his dead body when he would die and to scatter half of its ashes over the land and half in the ocean. By Allah, if Allah finds him in His grip, He would torment him with a torment with which He did not afflict anyone amongst the people of the world; and when the person died, it was done to him as he had commanded (his family) to do. Allah commanded the land to collect (the ashes scattered on it) and He commanded the ocean and that collected (ashes) contained in it. Allah questioned him why he had done that, he said: My Lord, it is out of Thine fear that I have done it and Thou art well aware of it, and Allah granted him pardon. (Bukhari; Muslim; Nasai; Ibn Majah; Muwatta; Ahmad, Musnad)

The hadith has reached us in sources through different narrations. As mentioned in the narration above in the dahir in respect to wording while it is mentioned that this man as fallen in doubt regarding the attribute of qudrah (Bukhari, ar-Riqaaq 25; Muslim, tawbah 25), in some narrations it is narrated that he had only been a sinner who had been forgiven due to his fear of Allah. (Bukhari, Anbiya 54; Ahmad Musnad Hadith no: 10674, 10704, 22169) Especially in these narrations a doubt regarding the qudrah of Allah and denial is not aforementioned. In another narration mentioned in Muslim the man utters that Allah is capable of tormenting him. (Muslim, Tawbah 25)

In the reply of this hadith the ulamaa had made ikhtilaf. In the aspects of i'tiqaad and fiqh when it is investigated we will come across this conclusion: He did not doubt in an attribute among the attributes of Allah, he only doubted some of the elements relating to the attribute.

According to the narrations regarding this man, he had been living in previous eras. Allah taala had given him property and children. However this man was a sinner and in a manner of speaking he was a grave thief. Meaning he would open graves and steal the belongings of the deceased. When he felt that death had become near, he gathered his children and informed them of his last request. He had commanded them to burn his corps and scatter his ashes on a windy day over the land and ocean after he had died. His children had fulfilled this request of their father. Allah had resurrected him after his death and asked

him why he had done such thing. The man replied that he had done such act due to his fear of Allah. Upon this Allah forgave him. Some narrations of the hadith have been narrated in this meaning. And in some others there had been an additional sentence the man had spoken to his children. The ikhtilaf are regarding this statement. “La in qadar Allahu alayya...” Because one of the meanings of this statement is to doubt the qudrah of Allah it had been taken in hand as a mushkil hadith.

In the dictionary mushkil means with problem. According to some, if a hadith seem contradicting to the principles of Islam the scholars will call this hadith mushkil. Or in real meaning sahih evidences don't contradict each other nor with any other principles in Islam. Scholars have written books about these ahadith. There are even books taken in hand regarding mushkil ayah. From infinite nass of sharee'ah the scholars of Islam had established the base principles and had made ta'weel of those fragmentary nass contradicting these base principles suitable to the base principles.

For this reason Imam Shatibi had stated: “With certain evidence, after the infinite principle is stable, if there is evidence that shows contradiction in the dhahir in any manner reconciliation must be done between them.” (Muwafakat, 3/9-10)

Likewise in the usul of 'ilm, the keystone is that when the dhahir of a nass shows contradiction, it is made ta'weel of.

Similarly in the sharh of Sahih Muslim, by Imam Nawawi after stating that the ahl tawhid will definitely enter jannah and that this is the base principle of the ahl sunnah, he states: “This principle is a principle stable by the book, sunnah and ijma. In the same manner regarding this principle, definite information has been produced with widespread report. For this reason when we come across this stable principle with another hadith which is contradicting in the dhahir, it is wajib to make ta'weel of that hadith in a suitable manner to the principle so that we could consolidate between the nass.” (Sharhu'n-Nawawi Ala-I Muslim, 1/99)

The verb qadara which the man had used has 3 meanings in Arabic:

- 1- Qudrah (as in strength and ability)
- 2- Taqdir (as estimation)
- 3- Constrict (as restriction)

According to the first meaning the statement would mean “If he is capable of this”. If ta'weel is made with this meaning, then this would mean having doubts in the qudrah of Allah. The scholars who prefer this ta'weel have 2 views. Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn Qayyim, Ibn Hazm and Ibn Qutaybah had stated that the ignorance of this man had been considered as an excuse that he had been mistaken in the attributes of Allah and because he had been ahl fatrah and risalah had not reached him he had been forgiven. The ignorance of this man had been regarding the attributes of Allah. Likewise being ignorant in the

attributes of Allah is only accepted as an excuse prior to risalah.

According to the second view when the man had made such statement he had lost his mind (capability to think) due to his fear of Allah in his death bed and therefore is not responsible in the sight of Allah for this. From the scholars who accept this view as an example, we could mention Ibn Hajar al-Askalani and his ustad Ibn al-Mulakkin, Imam Nawawi and Ibn Taymiyyah.

According to the second meaning of qadara meaning taqdir the statement of this man carries the meaning "if Allah wills". What the man had meant was the following: "After I die burn my corps and scatter my ashes. Maybe if you do this, Allah will not resurrect me and thus I will be saved from punishment, however if Allah wills He will torment me as he never tormented anyone before." According to this ta'weel, the doubt of the man was not in the qudrah of Allah it had been in the belief of akhirah. However this man had generally believed in the akhirah yet he believed if he had done this, Allah may not resurrect him again. The scholars had said because contradicting information had not reached him and because his ignorance was known by the Rasul he had been excused. Although such explanation is not contradicting tawhid, in theory, practically it is a distant ta'weel. Hence iman in akhirah is not directly understood from kalimati'l shahadah and although ignorance can be an excuse in this matter, it is a remote possibility that in practical a Muslim would not know this information. When we look at the dawah of the Rasul we will see that iman in akhirah is informed to the people along with tawhid. When Islam is explained to them they are informed about the punishment of those who do not believe in the akhirah and that those who do believe will be rewarded. Besides all, the rasul come as bearer of good tidings and warnings.

According to the third meaning the statement of the man has the meaning: "If Allah constricts for me the paths to be saved or if he constricts my torment in the akhirah and if He does not forgive me, surely He will torment me as He never tormented any other." And in order to remind himself his fear from Allah he had commanded his children to burn his corps after his death and to scatter it in the wind. The scholars have mentioned that burning the corps of a deceased individual in their sharee'ah could have been a type of tawbah. Or even if in their sharee'ah there was no such type of tawbah the man had done this to show his fear of Allah, to arouse compassion for himself and with the hope that his action will benefit him. (Imam A'yni, irshad as-sari 10/439; Suyuti tanwir al-hawalik 1/239; Imam Ibn'i Abdulbarr sharhu muvatta)

Other than these we could list the following views regarding this incident: This statement was an Arab figure of speech. In the Arabic literature this is called to mix doubt with certainty. His statement will inform doubt literally however the intention is not doubt yet it is certain 'ilm.

This man lived in the era of fatrah. For those who lived in the era of fatrah their responsibility is only tawhid. According to their sharee'ah it may be permissible that a kafir is forgiven, whereas in our sharee'ah no such thing exists.

This man had left such will for his tawbah to be forgiven. In the sharee'ah of the Bani Israil in order for

their tawbah to be valid, a hukm such as killing themselves is stable. (Ibn Hajar Askalani, Fathul Bari 10/284, Nawawi, Sharhul Muslim Imam Nawawi, 9/124).

In conclusion the scholars who have lived close to the era of the salaf such as Ibn Qutaybah, Abul Hasan al-Ashari, Hattabi, Ibn Hazm and among mutaahhirun who had continued the school of salaf Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn Qayyim and from the najd scholars Abu Batin had explained this mans situation to be ignorance in the issues of the names and attributes of Allah; the mutahhir scholars who are inclined to qalam and ta'weel such as Ibn Hajar, Nawawi and Ibn Jawzi have tried to make ta'weel of this hadith and spent effort trying to make tafsir of its dhahir meaning. As understood while those scholars who are inclined to act according to the dhahir of the hadith do not make ta'weel of the hadith the ahl qalam scholars who are members of the school of khalaf had made ta'weel of the hadith.

As Ibn Hajar stated the most strong view that has been mentioned regarding this hadith is that the man had made such statement in fear and while he had lost his sanity. He had not said what he had intentionally, meaning its true meaning. Rather the state he had been in is like the situation of the unwary, reckless and the forgetful who is not aware of that which emerges from himself. In this condition an individual will not be held responsible.

The weakest view is the view of those who claim "In the sharee'ah the man was submitted to it could be permissible for the kuffar to be forgiven." (Fathul Bari, the mention of the news of the Nabi)

If it is taken notice the view that he had been ignorant in the names and attributes is not the weakest view as some seem to claim, how can it be kufr? No one had made such claim before. In brief the claim that the view of Ibn Taymiyyah is kufr does not seem fitting. To say that this view does not belong to Ibn Taymiyyah is also not reasonable either, because the same view, the view regarding the man being ignorant in the names and attributes is also narrated by Ibn Qayyim, Ibn Hazm, Ibn Qutaybah and many other scholars. Because this hadith had reached a widespread degree, such opinion regarding the hadith also has reached a widespread degree.

This man did not deny Allah's Qudrah. He merely did not know about a certain part of Allah's power. He ordered his family to undertake this procedure because he knew of Allah's immense Power. He ordered this to his family out of fear of Allah. He feared Allah greatly as everything in the hadith hints to. Fear of Allah belongs to the mightiest forms of worship and greatest Tawhid. Such a great fear it was, that Allah forgave him and allowed him to enter Jannah.

It is undoubtedly clear that he was certain of his Lord and he was therefore a mu'min. In one narration the man said: "Oh Lord Out of fear of you (did I do all this)." In another narration of the hadith he says "By Allah if my Lord is able to put me together again then He will torment me with a torment such as He has not inflicted on anyone before." He feared from Allah for this reason he was forgiven. "Fearing Allah is one of the highest statuses. It is among what iman necessitates. Regarding this matter Allah ta'ala stated: "Be ye not afraid of them, but fear Me, if ye have Faith." (al-i Imran 3/175) "therefore fear not men, but fear me" (al-Maida 5/44) "Those truly fear Allah, among His Servants, who have knowledge"

(al-Fatir 35/28)” (Fathu’l-Bari) Ibn Battal al-Maliki wrote, “Allah forgave him due to the intensity of his fear of Him. The easiest way to draw nearer to Allah is with fear.” (Sharh Ibn al-Battal, 19/254)

It is also known that hasana (good deeds) will erase the bad ones.

Ibnu AbdulBarr said about him: “And this statement should it be correct erases every problem raised concerning the Iman of this man. Even if the narration of this statement is not correct, its meaning is definitely correct. Since the principles of the deen support this statement and the mind makes it necessary.” (Fathu’l-Bari 2/297)

Imam Ahmad narrated this hadith from Abu Hurayrah (ra) and from Ibn Mas’ud (ra) with the addition “He did absolutely nothing good except for Tawhid”. Abdullah Ibn Mas’ud narrated “This man did absolutely nothing good except Tawhid...” Abu Hurayrah (ra) has also narrated the same from RasulAllah (saw). Especially in the narration of Abu Hurayrah (ra) it is repeated twice. At the beginning and at the end: It was narrated by Abu Hurayrah, Al-Hassan and Ibn Sirin from RasulAllah (saw), who said: “There was a man among them who lived before you who did nothing good (in his life) except practice Tawhid... Allah forgave him (due to his fear of Allah). He did nothing good except practice Tawhid.”

Kastalani stated: “Not having any good deeds in the eyes of Allah does not mean the invalidation of all khair in general. On the contrary everything other than tawhid is invalidated and only due to tawhid he had been forgiven. Or else if his tawhid had not been mentioned his punishment would have been certain and he would not have been forgiven.” (Ahadithu’l-Qudsiyya, 1/90) For this reason it is stable with ittifaq that this man was an ahl tawhid Muslim. Almost all those scholars who comment on the hadith, regardless of how different their ta’weel may be, they had not fallen in ikhtilaf as regards to this man being a muwahhid and Muslim.

He did not doubt the resurrection. The only matter in which he had a doubt was that Allah will be able to put him together again after his corpse had undergone the procedure he ordered to be carried out.

Ibn Abi Jamra stated: “Here the mentioned individual was m’umin who had believed. It is because he had believed with certainty that he will be questioned and that there will be punishment given for the evil deeds.” (Fathu’l Bari, #6481)

The previous ahl qalam had taken in hand resurrection as a conductive matter, they mention the importance of belief in resurrection along with resurrection not being something which can be proven by ‘aql. For this reason in all aqaid-qalam sources the matters of resurrection is taken in hand under the heading “Semiyyat” (we hear about but do not actually see) or ghaybiyat (the Unseen we both hear about and do not hear about).

He was excused for his ignorance because he was among the ahl fatrah and absolutely not able to receive knowledge. **2- The ulamaa on the hadith**

Imam Nawawi stated: "The scholars had made ikhtilaf regarding the interpretation of this hadith. One group had said 'To ascribe this to be ignoring the qudrah of Allah is not correct. The reason is the one who has doubts regarding the qudrah of Allah is bizatihi (perse) kafir. Let alone at the end of the hadith it had been said he had done it out of fear from Allah. Whereas as, just as the kafir does not fear Allah he will not be pardoned. These individuals according to this have said there are two tawils for this hadith a) If Allah had predestined the punishment meaning if He had commanded. In this case this verb can be recited both as qadara and qaddara; both with the shadda (sign of emphasis) and without the shadda. In this case both meanings are the same b) The verb qadara here means dayyaka ala. It is stated in the ayah "restricting his subsistence for him" (Fajr 89/16) this is also the view said about this ayah "he thought that We would not straighten him" (Anbiya 21/87). Another group states: The statement is in the dhahir meaning. However this man had said this without realizing what he was saying. Moreover as his intention was not the real meaning of the word he did not carry such belief. On the contrary he had said this when fright, horror and extreme impatience had overwhelmed him. Such that his strength had been lost and was not able to think of what he was saying. The individual in such state is in a position of being inattentive and forgetful. Responsibility is not mentionable in such condition. Fundamentally this is like someone finding his mount being overwhelmed with joy and saying "O Allah! You are my slave and I am your lord." The individual who said this had not been made takfir of because his amazement had been taken over by his joy and was mistaken. This hadith had been narrated in a place other than Muslim as follows: Maybe I will remain hidden from Allah meaning I will not be seen to Him. This shows that his statement meant if Allah is capable of in the dhahir meaning. Another group had said: This statement is a type of metaphor and unique use in Arabic. This type of speech is called the doubt used metaphorically for certainty (to mean the certain information with the doubt signifying word.) As in this ayah "and certain it is that either we or ye are on right guidance or in manifest error!" (Saba 34/24) The manner of expression is doubt and what had been meant is definite certainty. One group had said: This man had been ignorant in one of the attributes of Allah. Where as the ulamaa had made ikhtilaf regarding the takfir of the one who is ignorant in the attributes. Qadi Iyad said: 'For this reason (here the individual who doesn't have knowledge of the attribute of Allah has been meant. Not the person in the hadith) Ibn Jarir at-Tabari had made takfir of him. Abu'l Hasan Ashari had expressed this first.' Others say: An individual will not be made takfir of due to being ignorant in the attributes. Moreover contrary to the one who rejects it, it will not exit him from the scope of iman. Fundamentally Abu'l Hasan al-Ashari had later changed to this view and had kept stable at it. The reason is because this man had not believed this to be true with a satisfied i'tiqaad and also he had not seen it as another deen and sharee'ah. Certainly the one who believes what he had said to be haq surely will be made takfir. These people say: If the Muslim is to be asked regarding the attributes only a few will know. A group had said: This man had lived in the era of fatrah which plain tawhid had benefited. According to the correct view prior to the arrival of sharee'ah there is no proposition because in the ayah it is stated: nor would We visit with Our Wrath until We had sent an messenger (to give warning)" (al-Isra 17/15) Another group says: In the sharee'ah (contrary to our sharee'ah) of this individual it is possible he lived in an era which the forgiveness of the kuffar was permissible, which according to the ahl sunnah this is possible in relation to mind. We could have been restricted from this, with this hukm in our sharee'ah. The evidence for this is "Allah forgiveth not that partners should be set up with Him" (an-Nisa 4/48) and other similar evidences. Allahu Alam (Nawawi, 7/70-74). **i- There is complexity in the dhahir of the**

hadith

In Fathu'l-Bari Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani stated: "Hattabi said: This hadith could be understood incorrect and it could be asked 'How could there be forgiveness to the one who rejects resurrection and the qudrah of giving life to the dead?' The answer to this question is as such: He did not deny resurrection. He presented ignorance and thought: When he does this he will not be resurrected and will not be punished. However his confession that he had done this out of fear from Allah establishes he had iman. Ibn Qutayba stated: Surely some among the Muslim are mistaken in some attributes. However they are not made takfir of for this reason. Ibn Jawzi had rejected this and said: His rejection of the attribute of qudrah is kufr with ittifaq. From this structure his words, if Allah is qaadir of me "Lain qadrAllahu alayya" the word qadara means if He constrains-constricts. It has been said this resembles the expression in this ayah: "restricting his substance" (al Fajr 89/16) meaning if He makes difficult, constricts. The meaning of his words maybe I will be left hidden from Allah 'idalal' is 'maybe He will miss me, ignore me. For example it is said when such and such thing went missing, it is lost. Such as in this ayah: "My lord never errs nor forgets." (Taha 20/52). Maybe the man had said this out of extreme impatience and fear. Like how the other had mistakenly said "You are my slave and I am your Rabb", or his words "if He recognizes" meaning "if he decrees punishment to me He will punish me." Or it means this he accepted the creator however because he lived in the era of fatrah the conditions of iman had not reached him. The most clear among all views is that he had made these statements when he had been defeated by horror and fear. Such that this condition had made him loose balance in his statements. For this reason he made these statements without the intention of its reality. Contrarily the state he had been in, is like the state of the unwary, careless and forgetful who are not aware of what had emerged from him. In this situation an individual will not be held responsible. The most remote possibility among these views is the one that in their sharee'ah the kafir will be forgiven." (Fathul Bari Kitabu Ahadithi'l Anbiya, 6/604)

Ibn Qutayba responded to those who claim that the Qur'an invalidated this hadith and stated: "You narrated that when a man commanded his sons "when I die burn my corps and spread my ashes over the sea. So that maybe I will be forgotten by Allah and will be saved." And the sons had done what their father had requested and that Allah had brought his body back together and later said 'what had forced you to do such thing (or something along those lines) and that man answered '(that which forced me was) Your fear O Rabb...! and that Allah had forgiven him. (Bukhari) Whereas this man is a kafir. Allah will not forgive the kafir as He had informed in the Qur'an." Ibn Qutaybah replies: "The meaning of (maybe) I will trick Allah (udihu'llaha) is 'maybe I will make myself forgotten by Allah'. Likewise you will say 'I forgot such and such' or 'I made this forgotten' (dalaltu qadha wa qadha, adlaltuhu). The ayah of Allah taala is as such "He (Musa) replied: "The knowledge of that is with my Lord, duly recorded: my Lord never errs, nor forgets" (Taha 20/52). Meaning my Rabb will not overlook anything. This individual has made iman in Allah, a man who accepts His existence and who fears Him. However he does not know one of the attributes of Allah. He believed when his corps had been burnt and scattered in the wind that he will be able to save himself from (the punishment of) Allah. Because Allah knew his admonition that he feared His (awj) punishment he had forgiven that the man did not know one of his attributes. Some Muslim can be mistaken regarding the attributes of Allah however individuals as such will not be given the hukm of being ahl jahannam. Their hukm will be left to that (Allah) who knows their niyyah

(intention) the best.” (Tawilu Muhtalifun Hadith)

Suyuti stated: “Ibn Jawzi in his Jamiu’l Masanid stated: This man who had performed no khair is a kafir, if so how was he forgiven? The answer to this is: Ibn Aqil stated: This man is an individual which dawah had not been made.” (sunnan Nasai, Sharhul Suyuti 4/113-114)

Ibn Hazm said: “This man did not know until the time of his death that Allah (awj) would be able to collect his ashes and when he did He (swt) would not be able to resurrect him. Allah had forgiven him due to the confession (of his fault), his fear and his ignorance. Some people who change the meaning of the word said: “The statement in the hadith: If Allah is able to do this... means if Allah restricts me. It is the same in the ayah of Allah: ‘But when He trieth him, restricting his subsistence for him, then saith he (in despair), My Lord hath humiliated me!’ (al-Fajr 89/16) This ta’weel is baatil. It is because the meaning of the hadith would be ‘if Allah restricts me surely He will restrict. When the meaning is such then there will be no meaning for his command to burn his body and spread his ashes. There is no doubt that this man commanded to be burnt and his ashes to be spread in order to be saved from the wrath of Allah” (al-Fasl fi al-Milal wa’l ahwal wa an-Nihal 69)

Imam Ibn Hazm (ra) stated: “There is a sahih narration from RasulAllah as follows: “There was a man who didn’t do any good deeds. When death came to him he said to his family: ‘When I die burn me. Then on a windy day scatter half my ashes over the ocean and half over the land. By Allah! If Allah is able to do this surely He will torment me like He never tormented any other of his creations’. Allah gathered his ashes, gave him life and asked him: “What made you do this?” The man said: ‘O Rabb! It was my fear of You.’ And Allah forgave him.’ Abu Muhammad (Ibn Hazm) said; this man did not know that Allah (awj) would be able to collect his ashes and when He did he would be able to resurrect him until the time of his death. However Allah had forgiven him due to his iman in the existence of Allah, the confession of his fault, his fear and his ignorance.” (al-Fasl fi al-Milal wa’l ahwai wa an-Nihal 3/252)

Regarding the one who denied all of or part of that which Allah had made sharee'ah for him Ibn Qayyim (ra) stated: “And the kufr of juhood (rejection/denial) is of two types: absolute (mutlaq) and restricted (muqayyid, khass). The absolute one is: that he rejects the sum of what Allah has revealed and His sending of the Messengers. And the restricted and specific: that he rejects/denies an obligation from the obligations of Islam, or one of the forbidden actions, or an Attribute that He has described Himself with or something about which He informed - deliberately - or giving preference to the saying of one who opposes it for whatever objective that might be. But as for the denial of that, due to ignorance, or a faulty interpretation, then a person is excused for this and he does not become a disbeliever by it. This is like the hadith of the one who denied Allahs qudrah over him and ordered his family to cremate him and to scatter his ashes... Despite this, Allah forgave him and had mercy upon Him, since he was ignorant, since that which he did was in accordance to the limits of his knowledge, and he did not deny the qudrah of Allah out of wilful opposition or denial (takdhib).” (Madariju’s-Salikin 1/338-339) Ibn Qayyim also said: “This man doubted in the attribute qudrah of Allah and resurrection. And he did not perform any good deed. Along with this Allah asked him: What made you do this? He said: The fear from you o Lord, You will know this better. And Allah forgave him.” (Hadi al-Arwah 269)

It is stated in the Sharh Ibn al-Battal that: "It is not in agreement with Allah's infinite justice that He would consider equal in punishment one who errors intending goodness and one who intentionally errors in clear opposition to the truth." (19/254)

Qurtubi stated the following while explaining al-Anbiya 21/87: "I say the scholars explained it in the same way while explaining the hadith of the man who never did any good deed, said that if he died, his family should burn him: 'By Allah, if my Lord takes hold of me...' (Bukhari; Muslim; Nasai; Ibn Majah; Muvatta; Ahmad, Musnad) According to the first explanation method this hadith means: 'By Allah if Allah, distress me, if He holds it tight regarding taking to accounting, punishing for the sins of course it will (meaning He will punish me as He never punished anyone before)... According to the second method of explanation it means: If Allah (swt) with His qadha and qadar legislates to punish every sinner due to his own sin, without doubt Allah (awj) will punish me due to my sins, as He never punish anyone else. Scholars of hadith narrated this hadith in Muwatta and some other books. The person who uttered this word was mu'min and muwahhid. Likewise some of the narrations of the hadith it is said that: "he never did any good deed other than tawhid". When Allah (swt) asked him: Why did you do that? He said: "O Lord it is because I was afraid of you" Hasyah (awe) is only present on a mu'min slave who confirms. As Allah (swt) commands: "Those truly fear Allah, among His Servants, who have knowledge." (Fatir 35/28) It is also said that the statement of 'he thought that We will never distress him' carries the meaning of question. The meaning of the statement is 'did he think that we will never distress him? And here the preposition hamza is eliminated due to concision. This is the view of Sulayman Abu'l-Mutamir. According to the narrations of Qadi Mundhir b Sa'ed some recited this statement with hamza (as a question)." (Tafsir)

The author of al-Ahadith Qudsiyyah narrated from the sharh of Bukhari by Qastalani: "What is meant by he had not performed any khair is not that in general all the khair is invalidated. On the contrary everything other than tawhid had been invalidated and it had been pointed out only for this purpose (his tawhid) he had been forgiven. Or else if tawhid had not been mentionable for him his punishment would have been for certain. Therefore he would not have been forgiven. Fundamentally this does not mean that he had hesitated that Allah had the qudrah to resurrect him. Or else he would not have held certain (yaqeen) iman. On the contrary he had exhibited his iman and informed that he had done this only out of fear from Allah." (al-Ahadith'ul Qudsiyyah li majmua min al ulamaa, 1/90) **ii- Ibn Taymiyyah on the hadith of ashes/qudrah**

Ibn Taymiyyah has taken this matter extensively in his Majmua al-Fatawa in matters of khafi (hidden beneath the plain meaning of a word or expression contained) within the issue making takfir of the individual. Sheikhu'l-Islam in his Majmua al-Fatawa while evaluating the matter he has informed that due to some accidental reasons some people will not be made takfir of due to their ignorance and has brought this hadith as evidence in the issue 'general takfir does not necessitate definite takfir.' After mentioning an individual who has newly entered Islam, who is not aware of the fard which are stable by tawatur or in matters which can only be known by risalah yet because hujjah had not been established the individual who is left within this ignorant state cannot be made takfir of, Ibn Taymiyyah states:

“This man thought that if the things he willed from his children had been done Allah would not have the qudrah to gather and resurrect him. Again this man thought that when anything had been scattered in such manner Allah would not be able to turn it into its old form. Each of these is the denial of the qudrah of Allah and his resurrection. This is kufr. However along with having iman in the command of Allah and fearing Him this man is an ignorant person and had deviated to a mistaken presumption. The hadith shows this clearly. Allah had forgiven him for this mistake. When he did this the man believed he would not be resurrected for sure. The hadith clearly shows this. The man had –at least-doubts regarding resurrection (meaning the resurrection of his tattered body to its old form), this is kufr. If risalah had reached him he will be made takfir of. The reason is because this would mean he had no iman in Allah (awj). Those who made ta'weel of the statement of this man “If Allah is able to” as “if Allah had destined this” or “If Allah will constrict” has been mistaken and had changed the place of the words. Because the man mentioned in the hadith, so that Allah would not resurrect him, he had commanded to be burnt and to be scattered and had said “when I die burn me and scatter me in the wind into the sea. By Allah if my Rabb is able to certainly he will punish me with a punishment he will not punish any other.” At the beginning of the second sentence after the first the harf fa (fa wallahi) had been used. This shows the reason of why he had this act done. He did this act because he thought when he did this Allah would not be able to resurrect him again. If this man had believed that when he had done this, as he believed in Allah being able to resurrect, when he had not done this then he would have known that he would not gain anything with this action.” (Then he began to prove the mistakes in other views and at the end concluded as such): “The correct explanation of this incident is as such: This man did not know all the attributes of Allah rightfully and he did not know the qudrah of Allah in detail. Most of the mu'minun are like this. Only in matters as such an individual will not become kafir.” (Majmua al-Fatawa 11/410-411)

Here Ibn Taymiyyah stated that because the hujjah of nubuwwa had not reached this man, he believed Allah would not be able to revive him and had informed us that this itself was denial and kufr. Allah forgiving such individual had been said to be for the reason that the man had been remote from the nabawi hujjah, he had been excused for his ignorance.

Again in one of these explanations about the matter of promise containing threats which have been revealed to definite individuals, due to the khair they have done they could be forgiven for reasons such as being given shafaa and after explaining reason individuals are excused as such that individuals who are left ignorant due to being remote to that which is known only through nabawi hujjah he had stated: “This man had doubted the qudrah of Allah. He had believed Allah would not be able to revive him. This is kufr with the ittifaq of the Muslimeen. However the man was ignorant and did not know this (did not have knowledge of this).”

Ibn Taymiyyah said: “However, and those who sit with me know this about me, I am always one of the most strongest amongst the people in forbidding that the individual should be named with the title due to takfir, being called a fasiq, or a disobedient one except when it is known that he has had the clear revealed hujjah (proof) established on him, in which case whoever opposes it then he becomes a kafir, a fasiq or a disobedient one and that is made general for the sin in the issues that have been explained in

word and the issues in action. “And the pious predecessors have always differed in much of these issues, but not one of them ever bore witness against the other, neither with kufr, with fisq, nor with disobedience... And I have made it clear that what has been related from the pious predecessors and the imams is with generalization of the statement of takfir on the one who says this and that, so it is more over the truth. But it is compulsory to make a difference between the general and the one that has specifically been named and this is the first issue that is disputed in by the Ummah from the large issues of the pillars. And it is the issue of the threat (of punishment from Allah). “For indeed the texts in the Qur’an with regard to the threat (of punishment from Allah) are general in nature, like the words of His, ‘Those who take the wealth of the orphans in oppression and wrong doing...’ (an-Nisa 4/10) “And likewise it has been related that ‘whoever does this, then he is this...’... And indeed this (the statement) is general in nature and it is the place of the words said from the pious predecessors, ‘Whoever said this, then he is this...’ Thus it causes the individual to be scared of being in the judgment of the threat and to do repentance or good things, actions that eliminate (the previous sins) or the accepted intercession. “And the takfir, it is from the threats, so truly if the statement (of kufr) is a denial of what RasulAllah (saw) said, but the man spoke it in the time of Islam (when he was a Muslim) or he was in the far away desert and things like this, then he did not disbelieve due to denial of what he denied, until the hujjah was established upon him. And if the man did not hear those texts, or he heard them and they were not established on him in his sight or he went away from them and he went away from what was compulsory due to interpretation of it. And if he is sinful, I always remember the hadith in Sahihayn, which speaks of the man who said: “ ‘When I die, burn me and crush (my bones), then scatter me in the sea, for by Allah, if Allah grasps hold of me He will torment me as He has not tormented anyone else in the world.’ They did that, and Allah said: ‘What made you do what you did?’ He said: ‘Fear of You.’ And He forgave him.” This man doubted the power (qudrah) of Allah and doubted that He would restore him if his remains were scattered; rather he believed that he would not be resurrected, which is kufr according to the consensus of the Muslims. But he was jaahil (grossly ignorant) and did not know about that; however, he was a believer who feared that Allah would punish him, so He forgave him because of that. One who is qualified to engage in ijtihaad and who bases his incorrect notion on some misinterpretation of some text but is sincere in his keenness to follow RasulAllah (saw) is even more deserving of forgiveness than such a person.” (Majmua al Fataawa, 3/229-231)

Sheikhul Islam in another source stated that Ali (ra) in his fight against the Haruriyya sect had mentioned this hadith in the issue of making takfir of the Haruriyya or not, he had mentioned that the statements of the Jahmiyyah could be kept hidden from the common people most of the time, that he mentioned in hidden issues this secrecy (being hidden) is an excuse for the common people and later brought this hadith as evidence and said that this man had doubted the qudrah of Allah yet because risalah had not reached him he had been forgiven by Allah.

“The verification of the issue in this matter is this: The claim presented could have been kufr. Just like the views of the Jahmiyya who had claimed Allah will not talk nor will be seen in the akhirah. However some individuals may not notice this is kufr. In that sense regarding the individual who says such he will say to be kafir. Likewise the salaf will say whoever states the Qur’an has been created that individual is kafir, whoever says Allah will not be seen in the akhirah that individual will be kafir however they will

not make takfir on a certain person. As explained previously until hujjah reaches that person. Just like the situation of the individuals who denies that salah and zakah are fard, who accepts alcohol as halaal, who accepts fornication as halaal and who makes wrongful ta'weel. Among the Muslimeen such hukm being established is greater than others. The hukm of the individual who has made mistaken ta'weel, that he is kafir will only be given after hujjah has been established to him. Likewise the ashabi kiram had done this regarding those who considered alcohol to be halaal. It is more suitable and appropriate to display the same attitude in situations which are not like this. The situation of the person mentioned in this hadith is like this: "When I die, burn my body and till I become mere coal and then grind it into powder, and when there is a stormy wind, throw me (my ashes) in it. By Allah, if my Lord takes hold of me, He would torment me as He has not tormented anyone else." (Bukhari; Muslim; Nasai; Ibn Majah) Although such individual had doubted the resurrecting qudrah of Allah if he had been burnt, Allah had forgiven him. Matters as such had been explained in detail in another place." (Majmua al-Fatawa, 7/191)

In his fatawa Ibn Taymiyyah also stated: "This hadith had come from RasulAllah (saw) as mutawatir. The ahl hadith and ahl sanad had narrated this from Abu Said (ra), from Hudhayfah and from him Ukba ibn Amr and others have narrated from RasulAllah through others. The ahl hadith know that this hadith expresses certain (yakeen) information. When bani adam had been burnt and his ashes were scattered regarding (the fact that) Allah resurrecting it, regarding this the man had doubt and ignorance regarding the qudrah of Allah. These are two main matters: First is about Allah, and that is to believe that Allah is qadir of everything. Second is regarding the day of akhirah. That Allah (awj) would resurrect the dead, and to believe that one would be resurrected upon their amal. Because this man had been an individual who believed in Allah and the day of akhirah completely, he feared because he had known that Allah would reward those who perform good deeds and punish those who performed bad deeds. This man feared that Allah would punish him due to his sins, and due to his belief in Allah and the Day of Judgment and due to him performing good deeds Allah had forgiven him. The good deed this man had performed was his fear of Allah. Also it is pointed out that in the kitab and sunnah until risalah is declared Allah will not punish anyone. Allah will only punish after risalah had been declared. If risalah had not reached someone in complete he will not be punished immediately. The individual which detailed risalah had not reached will not be punished unless he denies the general risalah of that which he is upon and the risalah." (Majmua al-Fatawa 12/491)

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) in his Majmua al-fatawa shows consistency in his views regarding this matter, in Jamiul Rasail his evaluations differ. For as much as in the matter regarding the takfir of the Jahmiyyah after he informs of Allah (swt) having lifted the responsibility of the ummah in situations such as forgetting and being mistaken he had lengthly mentioned this hadith and after explaining this hadith was mutawatir, he explains that the man had generally knew Allah, the day of akhirah, that Allah would resurrect after death and will reward or punish, yet out of the severity of his fear he had said such things. Later he resembles the incident of the man in the hadith to the individual who had lost his camel in the desert and said "I am your Rabb and you are my slave": "Surely he had fallen into mistake due to the severity of his fear. Just like when the man who had lost hope found his camel and made a mistake due to the severity of his joy." (Ibn Taymiyyah, Jamiur Rasail 1/159)

Ibn Taymiyyah in Majmu'at al-Rasail wa'l-Masail stated: "This hadith had come from RasulAllah (saw) as mutawatir. The ahl sahih and ahl musnad had narrated this from Abu Said (ra), from Hudhayfah and from him Ukba ibn Amr and others have narrated from RasulAllah through others. The ahl hadith know that this hadith expresses certain information. Even if this hadith does not express a certain information according to other than them. So this man had doubt and ignorance regarding the qudrah of Allah to resurrect the one who becomes in a state that he ordered his family to do. And whoever is burnt and scattered, Allah would not have qudrah to resurrect him, he had doubts regarding this and did not believe it in certain. These are two main matters: First is about Allah and that is to believe that Allah is qadir of everything. Second is regarding the day of akhirah. That Allah (awj) would resurrect the dead even if he becomes in this state, and to believe that one would be resurrected upon their amal. This man was one who believed in Allah and the Day of Judgment in general, meaning Allah will reward and punish after death in general. So this is a righteous deed. Due to his fear of Allah punishing him because of his sins and his belief in Allah and the Day of Judgment in general Allah had forgiven him. Surely he had fallen into mistake to the severity of his fear. Just like when the man who had lost hope found his camel and made a mistake due to the severity of his joy." (Majmu'at al-Rasail wa'l-Masail 3/346)

Ibn Taymiyyah had stated this man was ignorant regarding the attribute of qudrah and resurrection however the hujjah of risalah had not reached him therefore his ignorance was evaluated as an excuse for him. Besides he said that these issues are khafi and can be hidden from layperson and in some other place he interprets the statement of this man as intifaul qasd (unintentional). After we gather all the views of Ibn Taymiyyah regarding this hadith; we can summarize his words as follows:

This man lived in an era where he had not reached the hujjah of risalah. He performed ample sin and prior to his death he remembered the punishment he would receive due to the sin he had performed. Due to his extreme fear without knowing what he uttered, he ordered such will to his family (unintentionally and unwilling). This man thought if his ashes were scattered half over the land and the rest onto the sea, that Allah will not resurrect him. His iman in Allah, his fear from Allah and due to his extreme fear having fallen in such state that he did not know what he had said, had become means to be forgiven by Allah.

Although it seems there is contradiction between these two opinions of Ibn Taymiyyah, Allahu alam there is no contradiction. Ibn Taymiyyah states this man said this while in sakarat (the drunkenness of death) therefore he is excused and in other places he says that this man doubted in the details of the qudrah attribute and the one who erred regarding the attributes will not be made takfir before the hujjah has been established regarding the matter. If careful attention is paid, it will be understood that his mistake concerning the attributes is related to his state of sakarat. When the views of the ulama concerning the hadith which had been mentioned above is read carefully; it is clearly seen that this man believed in the attribute of qudrah in general however he had doubted regarding a special situation, whether this had been comprised with this attribute or not. Meaning this man believed in his regular life that Allah is qadir to everything. In his death bed while thinking about the sins he had performed and the punishment he will receive he was confused and did not know what to do and as a solution he made this will. He thought that if he ordered his family to burn him, he would not be resurrected and would

not be punished however for that instance he had not thought that Allah would gather his ashes also. Maybe he thought that if he does what he ordered to his son, Allah will disdain to gather him. He showed ignorance regarding the attribute of qudrah due to sakarat. His ignorance was not regarding the essence of the attribute of qudrah but the implementation of the issues to the necessity of the attribute of qudrah. If it is stable that Ibn Taymiyyah recorded the both views then reconciling these views will be in this way. Or he might have changed his view which is possible for any scholar and this certainly is not deficiency.

Ibn Taymiyyah had preferred not making takfir of the person who has ignorance in attributes however he performed the hukm of kufr regarding the issues of major shirk and the likes. We will quote some of his views. We already have mentioned his views concerning some ittihadiyya (ahl wahdat-i wujud). Moreover we also narrated his views regarding the takfir of the one who doubts about them.

The person, who compiles the statements of Ibn Taymiyyah, narrates the following from Ibn Taymiyyah: "Murtad (apostate) is the one who makes shirk to Allah, or a person who hates His Messenger or (hates) what he brought or who refrains from forbidding every evil by his heart or doubted that; there were from the sahabah who fought with the kuffar, or permitted that, or denied a non fundamental matter upon which ijma has been made upon, with a clear cut ijma, or he made intersections (wasait) between him and Allah, upon whom he relies and invoke them and ask them, (so such) is a kafir with ijma. And as for the person who doubts in an attribute from the attributes of Allah, in which its likes, one cannot be ignorant, and then he is an apostate. But if it is (an attribute) in its likes one can be ignorant, so he is not an apostate, that's why RasulAllah (saw) did not make takfir upon the person who doubted in the capability of Allah." (al-Intisar li-Hizbillahi'l-Muwahhidin)

If attention is paid to the statements of Ibn Taymiyyah it is seen that he makes takfir without condition of the one who performs shirk, the one who shows hatred against RasulAllah and whatever he brought or the one who does not reject the munkar with his heart or the one who appoints intermediates between himself and Allah, the one who does tawakkul to them, the one who calls upon them for help and the one who requests from them regarding the matters which only Allah can answer. However he differentiated between the one who is ignorant regarding the attributes of Allah and others. Ibn Taymiyyah contrary to Imam Ahmad and others, carries the view of pausing regarding the takfir of Jahmiyya and likes. Imam Ahmad and others however have made takfir of them.

The summary of all this is: The issue which most of the Jahmiyya erred was not in the asl of tawhid but the issue of attributes. Their rejecting or making ta'weel of Allah's istiwa on arsh is also within this content. Ibn Taymiyyah made takfir of the one who erred in the asl of tawhid and never did excuse them. Concerning this, it is possible to bring numerous examples from him.

He classified in his risalah regarding Wahdat-i Wujud the groups who claim that Allah rejoins with His slaves to be of four kinds:

- 1- Those who believe in special khulul: The ones who claim that Allah made khulul to special persons

and not everyone. Such as those Christians who accept Isa (as) as ilah and some of the groups of Rafawid who accept Ali (ra) as ilah.

2- Those who believe the general khulul: Jahmiyya who claim that Allah is everywhere.

3- Those who believe in special ittihad: Those who claim that Allah rejoins with some of His slaves.

4- Those who believe in the general ittihad: Those who claim that Allah made ittihad with all of the creatures, Ibn Arabi and his likes meaning the ahl wahdat-i wujud.

After classifying these groups Ibn Taymiyyah says that all these groups are kafir and ahl wahdati wujud overtake them regarding their kufr. Meaning the one who says Allah is everywhere due to giving degree of being ilah to the creature is a kafir and mushrik without doubt. He had fallen into the shirk of khulul. If they are not made takfir of then there is no meaning to make takfir of Christians who state lighter kufr than the kufr of the ahl wahdati wujud.

The one who rejects that Allah is on the arsh or the one who claims that Allah is everywhere should be asked about his statement. If he says that Allah is everywhere bidhahiti then he is made takfir of. If he does not mean this and accepts that Allah is separated from the creatures however he claims that Allah is not on the arsh then his claim is accounted under the topic of names and attributes and not asl of tawhid. The situation of this person will be accounted under the topic- the one who has ignorance regarding the names and attributes which the ulamaa had ikhtilaf. It is because arsh, istiwa, kursi and likes can only be learned from the hujjah of risalah. What we believe is -this is also understood from the dhahir of the view of the majority of the ulamaa- nass regarding these issues are widespread and the least is that, there is possibility to reach these nass, there will be no excuse in these matters anymore. However there are scholars who says that in the issue of names and attributes ignorance is excused and Ibn Taymiyyah is among them.

If it is said that Ibn Taymiyyah excuses khululiya, we will say: He had expressed that the madhhab of khululiya is kufr and shirk in other sources. There is ijma regarding this matter. Abdulqahir al-Baghdadi in his famous book 'al-farq bayna'l-firaq' accounted the madhhab of khululiya as one of the madhabs which is attributed to Islam although it is not among Islam and recorded ijma concerning them not being from ahl qiblah. Ibn Taymiyyah intended with khululiya those who reject or make ta'weel of Allah being on the arsh. It is because everyone who rejects Allah being above the creation is accounted as khululiyah. This is because this claim will take him to the beliefs of ittihad and khulul which claim that Allah is everywhere. However this is a reality that although the result of their madhhab and usul take them to the khulul, when it is asked to them if they reject khulul then they will not be accused of being ahl khulul. Likewise there are people that when they are asked about where Allah is, they will respond with the ayah "We are nearer to him than (his) jugular vein" (al-Qaf 50/16) If they are asked do you believe that Allah is in your jugular vein they will reject and say 'I do not mean that, I only mean with His ilm'. Statements of such people resembles the wahdati wujud in dhahir however they reject this in reality or at least they seem to reject.

Shatibi stated in his book al-Itisam: "According to what we heard from the scholars surely the madhhab of the ahl usul is as such: 'The kufr which is established through meaning, is not like the kufr established according to the dhahir of an individual.' How could it be! Even a kafir severely denies that meaning and rejects those who hold him responsible for it. He will not accept in anyway when he is explained which the kufr meaning of his statement necessitates." (al-Itisam 2/292) Again he states: "The view accepted by our scholars Maghrib and Jubbai and certainly which are relied on scholars is as such: What the madhhab necessitates is not madhhab per se. For this reason when the necessary meaning of his statement is explained to an individual he will surely reject this." (al-Itisam 2/292)

Shawkani stated: "To make takfir with that which something necessitates is among the greatest mistakes. If the individual who wants to danger deen resorts to this method he will have committed the murder of his own nafs." (as-Sayl'ul Jarrar, 4/580)

Sahawi narrates the view of his master ibn Hajar: "The one whose statement is clearly kufr or when the owner accepts when the necessary meaning of his statement is explained to be kufr he will be given the hukm of kufr. However if he rejects the meaning his statement necessitates even if his statement necessitates kufr he will not be given the hukm of kufr." (as-Sahawi, Fathu'l Mughis, 1/334)

Ibn Hazm (ra) stated: "It is wrong to make takfir of people with the ta'weel of their statements meaning, or the remote meaning it necessitates. The reason is because it is similar to the slander done to a rival and making him say something he has not said. Even if he has said something that could have a dangerous meaning a paradoxical meaning will have been established. That which is paradoxical and not clear is not kufr. On the contrary an individual accepting this paradox is good for his point of view because he will have avoided kufr. Therefore that which is correct is that an individual is made takfir upon the dhahir of his statement and his aqidah he clearly expresses. It will not benefit an individual to beautify his evil aqidah with his statements. However the hukm given regarding that individual will be built upon those statements." (al-Fasl, 3/294)

After narrating the views of the scholars regarding the situation of those who do not know some of the attributes of Allah taa'la, Qadi Iyad (ra) said: "Those who embrace the view that the mukallaf can indirectly be made takfir of, indicate that the one who ignores one of the attributes of Allah and accepts that only the characteristic that attribute necessitates and states that the individual who makes statements such as 'He is an alim but He has no 'ilm, He can talk but He has no qalam" like the Mutazilah madhhab, will be kafir due to the fact that ignoring the attribute of 'ilm will necessitate ignoring the characteristic of being an alim and indicate that it could only be said that the one who has 'ilm can be an alim. Therefore to those who embrace this view, it is as if this individual has clearly expressed his views. This is the rule on their behalf regarding what Musabbiha, Qadariyyah and their likes said. As to those who claim that the individual is not held responsible with that which his statements necessitate they will not make takfir of the individual who had made the statements we mentioned above regarding the attributes of Allah. The reason is because when those who make such statements are informed of the meanings their statements had been given regarding the attributes of Allah taala they will say: "We do

not say that Allah taala is not an alim and we do not accept these meanings which our statements necessitate. On the contrary like you we know that stating Allah taala is not an alim is kufr and according to our own usul we believe our statements (words) do not carry such meanings." Due to both these understandings people have made ikhtilaf regarding making takfir of individuals. If we understand this, we will understand the reason that has caused these people to have ikhtilaf regarding this matter. The correct thing is to not make takfir of people with that which their statements necessitate, to not give the hukm of disappointment, to consider them as Muslim in treatments such as qisas, inheritance, nikah, diyah, performing their salah, burying them in the Muslim cemetery and similar. However those who make such statements regarding the attributes of Allah taala, will drastically be disciplined and will be given severe punishments to convert from such bid'ah." (ash-Shifa 2/293-295)

In conclusion; it appears with the will of Allah that Ibn Taymiyyah does not excuse those who perform major shirk or likes but the one who has ignorance regarding the attributes. As he said: "Murtad is the one who associates partners to Allah or the one who curses RasulAllah and what he brought. Or if he thinks that one among the sahabah, tabi'een or atbau tabi'een fought along with the kuffar or if he sees this as permissible or if he rejects something which is stable with qati ijma or if he puts other means between Allah and himself and requests from them or prays to them... If he is ignorant regarding one of the attributes of Allah and one who is like him and is not ignorant in this matter then he is murtad; if he is ignorant with it then he is not murtad. For this reason RasulAllah (saw) did not make takfir of the person who doubted in the qudrah of Allah and resurrection." (Ikhtiyarat Ilmiyya 5/535)

After narrating the views of the ulamaa regarding the hadith, I say with the help and guidance of Allah:

1- The hadith which is brought as evidence is not related with asludden i.e tawhid. Therefore this cannot be used as evidence regarding the matters of tawhid.

Imam Nawawi in the section "The individual who die upon tawhid will certainly enter jannah" stated: "No one who dies upon tawhid will stay in eternal fire. Regardless of how much sin performs other than shirk... Just like the one who although performs all the good deeds yet dies upon kufr will not enter jannah... This is the summary of the view of the ahl haqq regarding the issue. Many evidences from the book, Sunnah and ijma has already established this principle. Regarding this matter, there are mutawatir nass that provide certain 'ilm. When this principle is fully settled, all the hadith regarding this subject must be understood according to this principle and when a hadith is seen to contradict it in the dhahir it is necessary to make ta'weel to make fit between the nass of sharee'ah." (Sharhul Nawawi 1/217)

2- The ulamaa making ta'weel of this hadith and interpreting it into different meanings other than its dhahir is the best explanation regarding the dhahir meaning of this hadith not being intended. It is because this is opposite to their abundant principles. They take the special and solitary issues in consideration according to the abundant principles. If excusing the ignorant was one of their principles; then they would have said: Surely this man was ignorant regarding the attribute of qudrah. For this reason he is ignorant and because of his ignorance he is excused. Therefore they would have been saved from making this much ta'weel. It is because ta'weel is sharr for them. Other than the dharurah it will

not be undertaken. For example when a solitary issue meaning insignificant evidence opposes the valid abundant principles, ta'weel will be done.

3- Was this man ignorant regarding the qudrah of Allah and resurrection? Answer: Certainly he was not ignorant regarding the qudrah of Allah. Evidence is as follows: He ordered his family to do what he willed. If he had doubts regarding the qudrah of Allah he would have said: When I die burry me with my body. If Allah is qadir He will punish me. However as ulamaa stated, he thought that if his family does what he willed, it is impossible to be gathered- meaning he thought this situation was impossible. Impossible things are out of the frame of qudrah. This situation can only be known with sharee'ah.

Dahlawi stated: "This man with certainty knew Allah had been attributed with complete qudrah. However qudrah is not mentionable in impossible things only in possible things. Therefore he believed his ashes being scattered half on sea and half on land was not possible to be regathered. He had not done this due to his belief that Allah had been deficient. On the contrary according to himself he had acted upon his knowledge. Upon this he had not been considered kafir." (Hujjatullahi al Baligha 1/60)

3- ta'weel is evidence that the insignificant nass is contradicting an abundant principle

Shatibi stated: "When a principle is established by istiqla (induction) and there is solitary nass which opposes it, reconciliation between these should be done. It is because without doubt Shari (law maker) will mention this solitary issue while considering the absolute general principles. Indeed with in the frame of the general intentions of the sharee'ah, being generality of this principle will be known by dharurah. Therefore when the situation is as such, as long as Shari esteems this situation it is not possible to abolish the mentioned fundemantal principles. When such situation is present it is impossible to esteem the abundant principle and abolish the insignificant (principle)." (Muwafaqat, 3/9-10) Again he said: "When a general or absolute principle is constant as opposing special cases are not taken in consideration it is also the same mentioning the special cases. There are plenty of evidences for this... 3) Without doubt special cases are insignificant. Insignificant cases will not violate the abundant principles. For this reason general hukm will be valid for the insignificant cases. Although the wisdom of the abundant principle is not appearent in insignificant cases." (Muwafaqat 3/261-262)

It is much known that a reason must be found for ta'weel: "The conditions of ta'weel: ... second; a reason must be found for ta'weel. For instance the dhahir of the nass opposing a principle which is known to be an obligation of deen or a nass that is stronger in sanad." (Abu Zahra, Usul al Fiqh, 106-107)

Again Imam Nawawi stated: "in the section "Those who die upon tawhid will certainly enter jannah"... The one who dies upon tawhid even if he performs sins among sins will not remain in jahannam forever. Likewise the one who dies upon kufr even if he did perform good deeds cannot enter jannah. In this mentioned matter this is the collected view of the madhhab of ahl haqq. Fundamentally with the evidences of Kitab and Sunnah and the ijma of those trustworthy from the ummah conjoin upon this principle. In summary the nass that conjoin at this point provide a certain belief. When such principles

become definite all hadith relevant or not will be evaluated according to this principle. When a hadith is mentioned that is opposing this stability, it is fundamental that it is made ta'weel of according to the general principle, in order to provide unity among the evidence of sharee'ah." (Nawawi 1/217)

To understand this matter first of all we need to analyse the term shirk. Shirk in the terms of sharee'ah means associating partners to Allah in His names, attributes and acts, or not directing worship particular to Allah. This is the shirk which ignorance cannot be an excuse and the one who claims excuse fall into kufr. This is the reason Tahawi brings forth the evidences regarding shirk not being forgiven. On the contrary having doubt regarding the qudrah of Allah is not shirk. Besides this is ridiculous in terms of shari and dictionary meaning of shirk. Having doubt regarding the qudrah of Allah is equal to rejecting the evidences regarding this, meaning kufr. But when one rejects this after the hujjah is established he performs shirk only because of making his own nafs a deity. In conclusion there is no such thing that scholars named this event in the hadith of qudrah as major shirk and do not make takfir of those who excuse ignorance in this type of shirk. We should think about the difference. Kufr cannot be excused once it is kufr in its real meaning. However when it is related with the hujjah of risalah then the one who does not know the hujjah, cannot be made takfir of. However shirk is not the same and the one who performs shirk is mushrik everytime. There is also this: shirk is the only thing which is stable with kawni hujjah and has ijma regarding it. There is ikhtilaf in other matters. In these matters of ikhtilaf, takfir of the one who does not make takfir is not a matter in question. The issue of the names and the attributes is one of the matters of ikhtilaf. According to those who say that the names and the attributes can be known by aql, the one who does not know them is kafir. It is because he rejected the kawni hujjah. According to those who say that the names and the attributes can only be known with the hujjah of risalah, he will be kafir only after he rejects it when the hujjah is established to him.

Tahawi said: "However a group among the scholars explain the hadith of Muawiya as such: (He said) I maybe make idlal of Allah due to the fact that he did not know the detail of Allah's qudrah and along with this mans ignorance will accept his iman and will connect this to his fear from the punishment of Allah. Meaning along him wanting to trick Allah they see him as mu'min and say Allah's forgiveness is due to this iman. And wanting to trick was not called to account because of his ignorance they will account this ignorance from the type of ignorance which does not take to kufr from iman." (Muskilul Athar)

"If a denier says this: how could it be permissible to make ta'weel of this hadith as you have made ta'weel of it? Here there is that which invalidates the iman in Allah which are the words: "By Allah! Allah can never be qadir of me" And it is known that whoever from a condition among all conditions invalidates the qudrah of Allah with it he will be kafir. Our answer to him was: in his will what the man had told his sons the words are not in the meaning of invalidating the qudrah of Allah upon any condition. If it was like this, ofcourse he would be kafir, Allah forgiving him would not be permissible, neither would his entrance to jannah. The reason is because Allah will not forgive the one who commits shirk to Him." (Muskilul Athar)

In Muntaka the sharh of Muwatta it is stated: "When the man commanded half scattered over the sea

and half on the land it would not be correct that the man meant with this I will incapacitate Allah and to have i'tiqaad that after doing this Allah will not be capable of reviving him. The reason is whoever has this i'tiqaad will commit kufr, the kafir will not be forgiven. The evidence for this, are these ayah "Allah forgiveth not that partners should be set up with Him; but He forgiveth anything else, to whom He pleaseth". "To those who reject Our signs and treat them with arrogance, no opening will there be of the gates of heaven..."

In the sharh of Ibn Battal it is mentioned: "Other scholars stated "in the qudrah in « لئن قدر الله عليّ » is in the meaning of qudrah which is the opposite of incapable. And that man thought that if he is burnt and his ashes are scattered on sea and land he would leave his rabb incapable in reviving him. And these scholars said the hukm of performing shirk against Allah will not be forgiven had not arrived yet, therefore his ignorance in not knowing qudrah had been forgiven. And in the hikmah of Allah there is no evidence of aql that this is not permissible. On the contrary aql denotes this: He is fadl, ihsan and owner of forgiveness to the sinner. Therefore we will say that the performance of shirk not being forgiven not being permissible was only after this command of Allah "Allah forgiveth not that partners should be set up with Him" (an Nisa 4/48)."

It becomes clear from the statements of the ulamaa:

When an abundant principle is established however something regarding a special state or insignificant evidence opposes it in the dhahir; it must be made ta'weel to interpret it to the mentioned abundant principle, to settle integrity in between and to relevance.

In this sense making ta'weel of the majority of the ulamaa is the biggest evidence for the dhahir of this hadith opposing the abundant principle which is established by them or a stronger nass. For this reason they have made ta'weel of it. **i- This man knew that Allah is qadir to resurrect**

The evidence for his belief in the qudrah of Allah is the riwayat in Muslim: "as I do not find any merit of mine which would please Allah, and if Allah were to take hold of me, He would punish me."

Regarding this matter Nawawi says: "Surely Allah is able to punish me." In many of the copies in our town it is like this. Likewise it has been narrated that the ittifaq of the narraters is like this. In the copy we have in hand the particle 'in' is with repeat. The second 'an' has been dropped in some trusted copies. According to this the first 'in' is conditional preposition and its meaning is: If Allah wants to He will punish me. This explanation is suitable to the mentioned narration. When it comes to the narration of the majority it is such that the first 'an' is stable with the second 'an' and there has been ikhtilaf in what it means. Indeed it is permissible that this is upon its dhahir. Likewise this individual had mentioned this, however in this case the meaning of his statement is: surely Allah is able of punishing me if you burry my corps. If you burn me into ashes and scatter me over the sea and land in this case he will not involve in me. And his answer will be as mentioned. Likewise the narrations are always conjoined like this. Wallahu alam" (Nawawi, 17/83-84)

It is understood from this that: this riwayat which most of the narrator have made ittifaq over, indicates openly that this man believed in general that Allah is qadir to resurrect him. His ignorance and doubt was regarding a detailed issue. Such ignorance regarding this detailed issue will not harm uluhiyyah of Allah. For this reason the following had been recorded regarding him: “had never done any good deed except tawhid”

Whereas doubting regarding the qudrah of Allah in general will negate the iman in the uluhiyyah of Allah. It is because how an incapable, ignorant, dead, deaf or someone who cannot create be an ilah? All of these contradict the uluhiyyah of Allah. For this reason not knowing one attribute of Allah is not equal to not knowing Allah. Only when this is related with His uluhiyyah, meaning without it Allah cannot be imagined then it is different. It is because ignorance in such attribute is equal to the ignorance regarding Allah meaning not knowing Allah.

When it comes to Imam Shafi regarding this matter he says: “Allah has names and attributes. No one can deny them. However prior to hujjah if he opposes something among them he will be excused for his ignorance. The reason is because the knowledge of names and attributes will not be grasped with aql, view and thought...” (Ibn’ul Abi Hatim, Manakibu Shafii, narrated from Yunus ibn Abdul A’la. Fath’ul Bari 13/407)

Ibn Hazm stated: “Except Muhammad b Jabir at-Tabari and Samhuni all of the Asharis said that without knowing evidence, one cannot be Muslim. Tabari said: Among the women and men who reach the age of puberty who does not know Allah, His asma wa sifat without evidence his blood and wealth will be permissible...When the child reaches 7 years old, one should start teaching him about Allah, His asma wa sifat and how these can be extracted from evidences... Asharis said there is no need to know with evidence before the age of puberty... Other scholars of Islam said: Whoever believes with his heart in certainty and utter La-ilaha illallah Muhammadun RasulAllah with his tongue and express that he confirms whatever he brings forth and reject all the other religions other than the religion of Muhammad this man is Muslim and mu'min.” (al-Fasl 4/280)

Imam Nawawi stated: “The scholars had made ikhtilaf regarding making takfir of an individual who does not know an attribute of Allah. Qadi Iyad stated: “One of those who make takfir of an individual as such is Ibn Jarir at-Tabari. Hasan al-Ashari was the first to give this hukm. Another group of scholars stated: Except for the one who knowingly denies, the one who is ignorant of an attribute will not be made takfir and for this reason the attribute of iman will not be lifted from him. Abul Hasan al-Ashari returned to this view and his statement was stable upon it. The reason is because the man who does not know the attribute does not believe that there are no other attributes for certain. And he does not claim this view as a deen or path. However only a man who believes that other than the attributes he knows- all other views are baatil, will be kafir. Those who carry this view stated: ‘Among the Muslim when they are asked about all the attributes of Allah, only so little of them will know these attributes.’ Allah knows the most correct.” (Imam Nawawi Sharhul Muslim 7/70)

These are observations of the scholars regarding the ta'weel of the hadith. After expressing all these,

will there be any room left for hesitation regarding the fact that implication cannot be made with what they implicated?

Ibn Taymiyyah does not make takfir on the person who is ignorant in the attributes. Abu Batin rejects and clarifies the doubts of those who tried to bring this incident as an example of acceptable excuse regarding asluddeen for defending the mushrik. shaikh Abdullah Abu Batin said: "and the people who contend on behalf of the Mushrikin takes proof from the story of the person who advises his family to burn him after his death, (they take proof saying) that the person who commits kufr while he is ignorant will not become a kafir. And only a mu'anid (stubborn) will become a kafir. And the answer for all of that is: Messengers who gave good news as well as warning, that mankind, after (the coming) of the messengers, should have no plea against Allah. And the greatest thing which with it they were sent and to what they were invited was: 'worshipping Allah alone and there is no partner for Him', and to forbid from shirk, which is worshipping any other besides Him. So if the person who commits the major shirk is excused due to his ignorance, then who and who is not excused!?...In this case the necessity of the mentioned claim, Allah has no right other than mu'anid. Of course the owner of this claim will not reject this excuse. Therefore it is normal for him to be contradicting with himself. It is because it is impossible for him to pause to declare takfir of the one who doubts regarding the risalah of Muhammad (saw), resurrection and other principles of the deen. Even if the one who doubts regarding these is ignorant. However the scholars of fiqh stated the following in the books of fiqh under the heading of 'the hukm of murtad' Muslim can be kafir after his Islam with a word, an action or a belief or doubt. If the reason of doubt was ignorance then within the same manner ignorance of the Jews and Christians likewise those who prostrate to the sun, moon and idols out of ignorance and also those who Ali (ra) burnt with fire should not be kafir. It is because we are sure that they are ignorant. On the other hand scholars made ijma of the kufr of the one who does not make takfir of Jews and Christians or those who doubt regarding the kufr of them. In addition although we believe for certain that they are being ignorant. Actually the claim of the excuse for the ignorant who perform kufr due to ta'weel, ijtihaad, mistake, taqlid or ignorance is surely contradicting with the Book, Sunnah and ijma. Essentially he is invalidating its asl with this state. He will be made takfir of without doubt if he invalidates its asl. For example, it is the same as the takfir of the one who pauses to make takfir of the one who has doubts concerning Muhammad (saw) being messenger. And as for the person who advised his family to burn him; verily Allah did forgive him for his doubt in an attribute from the attributes of the Rabb. So verily he forgave him due to the fact that he had not reached the message. And this is how many amongst the scholars said. And this is why shaikh Taqiyyuddin (Ibn Taymiyyah) said: whoever doubts in an attribute from the attributes of Allah in which one cannot be ignorant (means clear and in known) then he becomes a Kafir. (And if he doubts in an attribute) in which one can be ignorant, then will not become a kafir. He said: "that is the reason RasulAllah (saw) did not make takfir of the person who doubted in the capability of Allah, because he will not become a kaafir except after the message reaches him. And likewise Ibn Aqil said, and considered the matter as: Verily the dawah (message) did not reach him. And shaikh Taqiyyuddin chose regarding the attributes: that the ignorant will not become a kafir (in it). And as for shirk and its likes, nay (he will become a kafir in front of Ibn Taymiyyah) as you would come across upon some of his sayings if Allah wills, and we have aforementioned some of his sayings in Ittihadiyya and others besides them; (that) his takfir of the person who does doubt in their kufr. (Ibn Taymiyyah made

takfir of the person who doubts in the kufr of Ittihadhiyya and their likes). And person of the 'Ikhtiyarat' of him (the chosen ways/sayings of Ibn Taymiyyah) said: "The apostate is the one who makes shirk with Allah, or a person who hates His Messenger or (hates) what he brought or he refrained from forbidding every evil from his heart or doubted that; there were from the sahabah who fought with the kuffar, or permitted that, or denied a non fundamental matter upon which Ijma has been made upon, with a clear cut Ijma, or he made intersections (wasait) between him and Allah, upon whom he relies and invoke them and ask them, (so such) is a kafir with Ijma. And as for the person who doubts in an attribute from the attributes of Allah, in which its likes, one cannot be ignorant, and then he is an apostate. But if it is (an attribute) in its likes one can be ignorant, so he is not an apostate, that's why RasulAllah (saw) did not make takfir upon the person who doubted in the capability of Allah. So he generalized in what went above from the Mukaffirat (things which makes a person a kafir) and he differentiated in the matter of attributes between the ignorant and others. And with it the opinion of the shaikh is: to stop in making takfir of the Jahmiyyah and their likes, which is against the sayings of Imam Ahmad and others besides him, from the Imams of Islam. al-Mujid stated: We will make takfir of those who call upon all sorts of bid'ah. Also we will consider fasiq for example those who consider the Qur'an created or the 'ilm of Allah created or His names created, that he will not be seen in akhirah, those who shamefully slander the sahabah or those who claim iman is only belief and those who imitated the ones who claim such things. Whoever knowingly calls to this bid'ah and debates defending such individual will be given the hukm of kufr. Ahmad had mentioned this in many places (sources). Look to see how the hukm of kufr had been given regardless of their ignorance." (al-Intisar li Hizb'illah al Muwahhidin, 16-18 *Aqidah al Muwahhidin first chapter 16-19) **4- Final words**

Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn Hazm and those who carry the same view as them excused this man due to his ignorance. It is because this man was not generally ignorant regarding the qudrah of Allah and resurrection. His ignorance and doubt was regarding something he found to be impossible. He was excused by Allah because of he had not reached hujjah by a rasul. Contrary to this, whoever doubts in the asl of qudrah of Allah; this will harm the belief of uluhiyyah of Allah and no one will be excused regarding this. For this reason Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn Hazm and those who are on the same view of them bring this hadith as evidence to show ignorance and ta'weel regarding the names and attributes is not kufr all the time and this will not take one out of fold of Islam. In this matter, ones ignorance of an attribute is an excuse which prevents one to be judged as kafir. However if the evidences are explained to him and yet he rejects this information he will become a kafir. Again if there is ignorance present regarding the uluhiyyah of Allah meaning something which Allah cannot be imagined without it, then the hukm is different. In this issue there is no excuse and ignorance cannot be an excuse.

Our aim here is not to choose between the view of Ibn Taymiyyah or the view of Tahawi. Of course there is a view that we accept to be more correct than other views which is 'this man uttered it while the sakaratu mawt (drunkness of death) had overtaken him and he uttered it unintentionally'. However here we are not discussing this issue because it is not the main concern. The point which we want to make clear is the ikhtilaf regarding this matter is not an ikhtilaf regarding asluddeen. Otherwise we would claim that scholars did not perform takfir regarding those who had not accounted it as shirk, which there will be no other choice but to make takfir of the ulama and all the ummah. And the one

who believes that it is shirk in asluddeen and does not make takfir of the ulamaa will also be made of takfir.

If one believes that Allah created the universe and He is the only ilah, he certainly has knowledge and belief regarding the qudrah and ilm of Allah. Otherwise how can an ilah who is incapable, ignorant, and blind create the universe, manage and tadbir (govern). Here our discussion is not about the minimum knowledge of the attributes which is related with tawhid. No one here is claiming ignorance in asluddeen is an excuse. The issue we are discussing here is to show if it is possible that one can be aware of all the details of the attributes or can he only know this completely with the sharee'ah, meaning no doubt that complete knowledge is with sharee'ah, but will one be responsible with this without the hujjah of risalah having reached him?

No one except the kafir and mushrik excuses ignorance in the attributes which will harm uluhiyyah and rububiyah when it does not exist. None of the scholars meant this when they made ta'weel of this hadith which we quoted above. It is because this is settled in the fitrah and it is stated in the ayah of misaq (al-Araf 7/172). Mankind confirmed the rububiyah of Allah when he was asked about "Alastu bi rabbikum" (Am I not your Lord) while stating "Qalu balaa shahidna" (Yea! We do testify!) in the worlds of spirits. And it is also clear that rububiyah necessitates uluhiyyah. There is no excuse of this in tawhid neither in the names and attributes or any other issues.

Regarding the six pillars of iman there is no excuse neither in normal times nor in the era of fatrah and whoever does not fulfill the requirements, cannot be mu'min. However during the times of dark fatrah when there is or was no way to reach the ilm –as an example the stranded life of Robinson Crusoe or Hayy bin Yaqzan- the person is only responsible with tawhid. We do not say that in other issues ignorance can definitely be an excuse, however it is understood from the dhahir of the views of the ulamaa that there are some who believes in such and it is not possible to make takfir of them.

"All praise to Allah who saved the deen of this ummah by narrating issues with the hands of the ulamaa, who are the same as the prophets of bani Israil, and transmit the issues to us. He leads us to this path. Allah (swt) destroyed all the bid'ah and deviation within the ummah with the scholars. What a great blessing it is for those who do what is required while accepting haqq, those who know this and understand it and those who are pleased with it." (Abdurrahman ibn Hasan, Refutation to Jahmiyya)

(iii) Wrongful conclusions extracted from the statements of the scholars

The issue of scholars attributing a muayyan (specific) person with the state that the person is in and their approaches regarding the matter. In this section with the permission of Allah (awj) first of all I am going to take in hand the situation of scholars Ibn Taymiyyah and his students, Muhammad bin Abdulwahhab and the ulamaa of Najd and other scholars regarding the matter of whether or not the mushrik can be excused because of his ignorance. And then I will clarify the wrongful conclusions which are extracted from the statements of the scholars inshaAllah. No doubt these scholars have not

excused anyone with regards to sticking to the essence of asluddeen; tawhid and abandoning shirk.

1- The Mushrik can not be considered as Muslim

Their description and qualification of Islam clearly indicates that the mushrik can not be considered as Muslim. We had already mentioned some of their statements previously. I will also narrate some of their statements here inshaAllah.

Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) said: "Without doubt tawhid is the essence of iman. This is the alamati fariqa which distinguish ahl of jannah from ahl of jahannam. Moreover this is the fee of jannah. No ones Islam can be sahih without it."

He also said: "The religion of Islam which Allah consents with and He (swt) sent His messengers with, is submitting solely to Allah. Its asl is in the heart, it is submitting to Him while abandoning anything other than Him and worshipping only Him. From now on whosoever worships Him and another deity besides Him is not Muslim. And whosoever does not worship to Him, becomes arrogant to Him in ibadaah, he also can not be Muslim. It is because Islam is submitting solely to Allah."

Ibn Qayyim said: "Without doubt Islam is neither solely marifah nor solely marifah and utterance. On the contrary it is marifah, utterance, submission and sticking to His religion while obeying in both dhahir and batin."

He also said: "Islam is making the oneness of Allah, ibadaah being made solely to Him without performing shirk, making iman to His Rasul and submitting to that which he (saw) had brought. From now on whosoever is not in this state, he is not Muslim. Even if such person is not a muannid (stubborn) kafir, he is an ignorant kafir."

Shaikhul-Islam Muhammad Ibn Abdulwahab said when he was commenting on the hadith: "Whoever says La-ilaha illallah and disbelieves in all that is worshipped besides Allah...": "Know, may Allah have mercy upon you, that this statement is the distinction between kufr and Islam. It is the statement of taqwa and the firmest handhold, as was made by Ibrahim (as): "And he made it (i.e. La-ilaha illallah) a Word lasting among his offspring, that they may turn back (i.e. to repent to Allah or receive admonition)." (az-Zukhruf 43/28) However, what is intended here is not just speech upon the tongue while being ignorant about its meaning. For verily, the hypocrites say 'La-ilaha illallah', pray and give in charity, but they will be below the disbelievers, in the lowest part of the Hell-Fire. Rather, what is intended is to say the statement while having recognition of it in the heart, loving it and its people and having hatred and enmity to whatever or whoever opposes it, as RasulAllah (saw) said: "Whoever says La-ilaha illallah sincerely....", in another narration: ".... sincerely from his heart...", in another narration: "Truthfully from his heart...", and in another hadith: "Whoever says La-ilaha illallah and disbelieves in all that is worshipped besides Allah...", as well as many other ahadith which indicate that most people are ignorant of this testification."

He also said: "This is the biggest proof which explains the meaning of 'La-ilaha illallah'. Without doubt he (saw) did not find utterance sufficient for the protection of blood and wealth. It is because neither uttering nor accepting this word, while knowing the meaning of it; yes none of these can not make ones blood and wealth protected. Until adding this to rejecting those who were worshipped besides Allah. Surely hesitation and pausing will not protect the wealth and blood. Now, to those who have not a bigger and important issue than this matter and to those who have a proof and explanation which will explain this and will cut the discussion off, the issue is crystal clear."

Indeed these were mentioned before with the sources. I reminded these to the readers so that they can easily understand that grave-worshippers and other mushrik are not considered as Muslim by these scholars. This was the first issue that I wanted to clarify.

2- Slaves are certainly in one of two states; tawhid or shirk either a muwahhid or mushrik

The second of these is that the scholars had mentioned people are in two groups and that there will be no third. These people are either muwahhid who worship solely Allah and do not perform shirk, or mushrik who worship others besides Allah.

As it is known the grave-worshipper or anyone who presents anything which should solely be presented to Allah with regards to uluhiyyah, is not someone who solely worships Allah. When it is as such, they will not be muwahhid. Therefore they are mushrik. This is because there isn't the existence of a third in this classification.

Ibn Taymiyyah says: "For this reason it is mentionable that anyone who does not solely worship Allah is slave of another other than Allah. He will worship another besides Allah and thus become mushrik. From now on there is no third group among Bani Adam. On the contrary he is either a muwahhid or mushrik. Or among those who mixed this with the other like the Nasara who altered their religion. Like those ahl hawa and those who are on dalalah but claim to be affiliated to Islam. Now whoever does not worship Allah while making his religion solitary to Allah, there is a necessity that he is absolutely a slave of other than Allah, as a mushrik. Indeed he is slave of shaytan. According to this every single person of mankind is either the slave of Rahman or slave of shaytan. In the ayah it is stated: "If anyone withdraws himself from remembrance of (Allah) Most Gracious, We appoint for him an evil one, to be an intimate companion to him. Such (evil ones) really hinder them from the Path, but they think that they are being guided aright! At length, when (such a one) comes to Us, he says (to his evil companion): "Would that between me and thee were the distance of East and West!" Ah! evil is the companion (indeed)! When ye have done wrong, it will avail you nothing, that Day, that ye shall be partners in Punishment!" (az-Zukhruf 43/36-39)." (Fatawa, 14/282-285)

"Truly, that Day, they will (all) share in the Penalty." (as-Saffat 37/33)

Ibn Qayyim says: "Whoever's heart is filled with the love of Allah, His dhikr, His awe, who made tawakkul to Him and who turns to Him, this will make it needless to love another, fright him from making tawakkul to another. In the same approach it will save him from being fond of (to fall in love with) faces. But if he keeps distant from this then he will be slave of his hawa. Meaning he will start worshipping something which his malaka (mental power) finds fine. Indeed the one who turns his face from tawhid willingly or unwillingly is a mushrik. Likewise the one who turns his face from sunnah willingly or unwillingly, is a deviated bid'ah doer." (Ighasatu'l Lafhan, 1/214)

He also said: "In the ayah it is said: "And who turns away from the religion of Ibrahim but such as debase their souls with folly?" (al-Baqarah 2/130) As it is seen Allah (swt) divided creatures into two; safih and rashid. Safih is the one who turns away from his religion and goes to shirk, Rashid is the one who keeps distant from shirk with statement and amal. Henceforth his statement is tawhid, his amal is tawhid and his state is tawhid. Moreover his call is also tawhid." (Madariju's-Salikin, 3/446)

3- Conditions of ibadaah and its invalidation by shirk

Third of all these, the scholars say: Without doubt worshipping solely Allah can not be present with (alongside) shirk. No doubt one of the conditions of realization of iman is, knowing mabud. However mushrik is ignorant to Allah. Allah without doubt is, Rabb, Malik and the Creator of everything. For this reason He deserved to be ilah. Therefore it is a must to thank Him without performing shirk. The mushrik does not know this. Likewise one of the conditions of ibadaah is to direct it to solely Allah, who is One and Who has no partner. Also the one who turns to Him should be Muslim during the time that he turns to Him. This can only be within this frame. In the ayah it is stated: "Were ye witnesses when death appeared before Yaqub? Behold, he said to his sons: "What will ye worship after me?" They said: "We shall worship Thy god and the god of thy fathers, of Ibrahim, Ismail and Ishaq,- the one (True) Allah: To Him we bow (in Islam)." (al-Baqarah 2/133)

Allah Taala absolutely is the only ilah. He has never permitted other deities. He is One in uluhiyyah. This is an infinite attribute for Him and it can not be separated from Him. Indeed He can be worshipped only with this. Moreover in ibadaah this attribute of ilah is not sufficient. During this the one who turns to Him should also submit to him (be Muslim). Meaning, when turning towards Him, he should in dhahir and in batin without performing shirk, submit to Him and subject to Him. So ibadaah can only be performed in this manner. This is the summary of the tafsir of Ibn Taymiyyah on the ayah: "(O Muhammad!) Say: O disbelievers!" (al-Kafirun 109/1) As it is known mushrik is ignorant of all of these.

Ibn Taymiyyah says: "Ahl nadhar and ahl kalam and also ahl aqaid among the muhaddith etc. mention about the essence of irada; ilim, marifah and tasdiq. They say: In ibadaah intention must be present. Intention can only be possible after the knowledge regarding the mabud which is intended (to worship). This is correct. So the knowledge concerning the one who is worshipped and the thing which is worshipped with being present is fundamental. Deviated mushrik and nasara (Christian) and their

likes have some types of ibadaah and asceticism. However these are either towards other than Allah or in a manner other than Allah commanded. Without doubt intention and beneficial irada is the irada of solely worshipping Allah. This is one worshipping according to what the sharee'ah commands and not with bid'ah. In this sense the religion of Islam is based upon the following two principles. These are: a) Ibadaah solely to Allah b) Worshipping according to the way which sharee'ah anticipates and not according to bid'ah." (Fatawa, 19/172-173)

Ibn Qayyim states that the ibadaah which is the right of Allah over His creation is merely based upon ilm, knowledge. He says: Now is it possible to reach ilm without the request for it.

Ibn Taymiyyah says the following while giving explanations for the surah al-Kafirun: "Nor will ye worship that which I worship." (al-Kafirun 109/5) "This takes their shirk in hand. When they perform shirk to Him they can not be slaves to Him. Even if they pray to Him and perform salat to Him." And he also says: "According to this whenever one worships Allah while making His deen pure to Him, he is Muslim."

Ibn Taymiyyah manifests that without doubt only the one who is among his millah (religion) can worship the ilah of Ibrahim. The mushrik can not be among the millah of Ibrahim. It is because his millah is abandoning shirk knowingly with intention and obedience to Allah with tawhid and without shirk. As Yusuf (as) said: "I have (I assure you) abandoned the ways of a people that believe not in Allah and that (even) deny the Hereafter. And I follow the ways of my fathers, - Ibrahim, Ishaq, and Yaqub; and never could we attribute any partners whatever to Allah." (Yusuf 12/37-38)

Again the imam says: "The mushrik who takes other deities with Allah in absolute means is not comprised by the term iman. Likewise whoever worships two ilahs; he will not be worshipping the ilah of Yaqub. No doubt only the one who directs worship to the One (Only) ilah (Allah) is considered to worship his (Yaqub's) ilah. If he is such person who worships another while worshipping Him; his ibadaah is of two types. Ibadaah of shirk and ibadaah of ikhlas. Whoever worships others while worshipping Him (Allah), he will not worship Him with acceptance of Him being the only ilah. Whoever performs shirk to Him (Allah), it means that he did not worship Him (Allah). It is because He is absolutely solely One ilah. Now at this point, when He is not worshipped in the manner which is required, then ibadaah which is performed in other ways will not be considered directed to Him (Allah) therefore it is not considered that He (Allah) is worshipped."

4- Attribute of shirk is constant even before risalah; the evidence for this is aql and fitrah

The fourth point is that these scholars prove that the attribute of shirk is constant prior to risalah and the evidence for this is aql and fitrah and this won't necessitate a messenger, besides this with relying upon the ayah "nor would We visit with Our Wrath until We had sent an messenger (to give warning)." (al-Isra 17/15) punishment will only be after the nabawi hujjah.

Ibn Taymiyyah says –this issue had been mentioned in the matter of goodness and badness-: “The majority of the salaf and khalaf are upon the following view: Prior to the coming of a prophet; shirk and jahiliyya which the person was upon, of course bad and ugly. However this will not necessitate punishment until the prophet comes.”

Likewise he says: “All of these express the badness of the state they were in, prior to the prohibition and prior to the prophets coming. If the goodness of tawhid and worshipping Allah who has no partner, and the badness of shirk in the inside of the actions/actors, if it was not known by aql He (Allah) would have not addressed them with it. Indeed the name of mushrik is constant prior to risalah. It is because the mushrik associates partners to Allah and accounts things to be equivalent to Allah even before risalah. He appointed deities besides Him and He was accounting nidd (partners) to Him.”

Ibn Qayyim in his commentary to the ayah of mithaq said: “This also shows that aql itself which recognizes tawhid is clear hujjah for shirk being baatil. Furthermore it won’t necessitate a prophet. Without doubt He (swt) accounted aql as a hujjah against them prior to risalah. This will not contradict the ayah: "nor would We visit with Our Wrath until We had sent an messenger (to give warning)." (al-Isra 17/15)”

Ibn Taymiyyah said: “As regards legal terms and rulings, Allah separated between some of them and united some of them concerning what was before the Risaalah (before the receiving of the Message) and that which was after it. Therefore, the term Mushrik is applied to a person before he receives the message and (before a Prophet comes to him) because he is already worshipping something besides Allah and equalizing something with Him and taking for worship gods other than Him. So these terms exist before the coming of a Prophet just like the term Jahl and Jaahiliyyah. The terms Jaahiliyyah and Jaahil are used even before the arrival of a Prophet but there exists no punishment for the Jaahil.” (Fatawa, 20/37)

The attribute of mushrik is constant prior to risalah. The hujjah of this are aql and fitrah. If it is not then what is the situation after the risalah? **5- Ignorance is the main reason for shirk being dominant over nafs**

The fifth issue is: Shirk is constant and valid in the time of ignorance. Moreover ignorance is the main reason for shirk being dominant over nafs. This ruling is general for all the mushrik. Whether he is from our millah or from other millah and religions, there is no difference.

Ibn Taymiyyah says: “This is associating partners to Allah. That which is worse than this is: Making dua to other than Allah which some of the ignorant mushrik that fall into shirk do, while stating ‘O master forgive me and accept my repentance!’ The worst is making sujud to the grave of the deceased, praying while directing it to the grave and seeing this prayer better than the prayer which is prayed while directing to the qiblah. Moreover some of these people say: This is (grave) the qiblah of hawas

(upper classes) Qaba is the qiblah of awam (laymen).” (Fatawa, 1/351)

He also stated: “Those who worship hawa and desire are of many degrees. The mushrik and those who worship things which they find to be good other than Allah, are among these” (Fatawa, 10/592)

He also says regarding some of the tasawwuf groups which fall into shirk: “Some of them said: We are taking repentance from people. I said: What are you taking repentance from? They said: Knock over, thievery etc. I said: Their state before you take their repentance is better than their state after you took their repentance. Without doubt they are fasiq who believe that the state they are in is haraam. They ask forgiveness of Allah, they repent to Him or they incline to. But with taking repentance from them, you made them deviated mushrik and individuals who went out of the fold of Islam.” (Fatawa, 11/472)

“If you say: Some of the people perform such shirk near his (saw) grave. I tell you: No one can be able to do this near to his grave. Without doubt Allah (swt) had accepted his (saw) following dua: “O Allah! Do not make my grave an idol that is worshipped.” (Malik; Abdurrazzak; Ahmad, Musnad) When it comes to his (saw) masjid; no doubt some grossly ignorant people do that. But those who know the Islamic sharee'ah do whatever sharee'ah indicates. And they forbid them from this filth as much they can. For this reason visitors do not unite on dalalah (deviation). But when it comes to those other (graves) then his (saw); all of those who travel there are ignorant, deviated mushrik. They become in this state near the grave and no one exists there to prevent this.” (Fatawa, 27/269)

Ibn Qayyim narrated from Abul Wafa and said: “I saw Abul Wafa wrote a nice passage, I am quoting verbatim (word for word) from him: When the rulings of sharee'ah become hard to some ignorant and laymen, they incline to the rules which they set up themselves while leaving these rulings (of sharee'ah). Thus they made it easier for themselves. It is because with this they had not entered anyone's command. With these rules; revering the graves, offering to them, asking for needs to the one in the grave, writing a note and asking to do this and that... with such rulings they are kafir in my presence.” (Ighasatu'l Lahafan, 221)

After quoting this from ibn Qayyim, Shaikh Sulayman bin Sahman said: “So many scholars quoted this statement in a manner of acceptance of it and being consented with it. Such as Abu'l-Faraj Ibnu'l-Jawzi, Imam Ibn Muflih, Imam Shawkani.” (Taysirul Aziz al-Hamid, 228)

Ibn Qayyim says: “Shaitan makes fun of the mushrik while they worship idols. There are various reasons for this. He plays with every tribe according to their intellect. In this sense he calls a group to worship himself. For example, idols in the manner that they revere to them, are that which they portray in the feature of the dead. Likewise this occurred in the tribe of Nuh (as). For this reason RasulAllah (saw) cursed those who obtain masjids over the graves and light candles. Also he (saw) restricted to perform salah towards the graves. Meanwhile he (saw) requested from his Lord that his grave shall not be a temple. Likewise he (saw) requested from his ummah not to make his grave a

place of fest. He (saw) said: "Punishment of Allah towards those who obtain the graves of prophets as masjids will be plenty." In this manner he (saw) commanded the graves be leveled and to destroy the statues. Now mushrik have opposed him in all of these matters. At that; whether they do this because of their ignorance or their stubbornness towards the ahl tawhid. Hence this will not harm the muwahhidun in any way. But this is the main reason of the state which laymen of the mushrik are in." (Ighasatul Lahafan, 2/222)

Ibn Qayyim (ra) said: "When it comes to speaking regarding Allah without knowledge... There is no greater sin in the sight of Allah than speaking regarding Him without knowledge. The essence of shirk and kufr is this sin. The bid'ah and deviations are built upon it. Therefore the essence of every bid'ah and dalalah (misguidance) in deen is speaking regarding Allah without knowledge... The essence of shirk and kufr is speaking regarding Allah without knowledge. It is because the mushrik suppose that; he accounts the object as a deity for himself, that will take him close to Allah, that it will be an intercessor in the sight of Allah for him and as the mediators in the sight of kings, that he can meet his needs. Therefore every mushrik speaks regarding Allah without knowledge. However everyone who speaks regarding Him (awj) without knowledge is not mushrik. The reason is; speaking regarding Allah without knowledge sometimes involves the ta'til (denial) of the sifaat and inserting the bid'ah into the deen of Allah. So speaking regarding Allah without knowledge is a more general word than shirk. Shirk is only one of the meanings it includes." (Madariju's-Saliheen, 1/378)

He also says: "It is not permissible to leave a place of shirk or a place which is related with taghout not even for one more day when able to destroy and remove. It is because they are signs and symbols of shirk and kufr, they are the greatest places which are disliked in Islam. It is definitely not permissible to leave as it is for the one who has the ability to destroy it. This is also the ruling of the places which are built upon graves and accepted as idols and taghout by people and leave Allah aside. According to this it is not permissible for anyone to leave them on the earth that has the ability to destroy such places which are visited with reverence and (with the intention of) seeking barakah (blessings), taken a wow and stones which are kissed. Most of these stones replaced with the ancient idols Lat, Manat and their third Uzza. The shirk which these (stones etc.) cause and the shirk which is performed near them is even greater. Help is from Allah. None of those, who worshiped the idols of those days, believed that those idols were the ones who created, who gave livelihood, who killed and resurrected. Everything that they were doing beside and towards those idols consisted of what their mushrik brothers of today is performing beside their idols. The doer of such submit to the sunnah of those before them, follow their way step by step and obey them inch by inch, crawl by crawl in every matter. Shirk become dominant over many because ilm is lifted, and ignorance is apparent. As a result of this maruf is accepted as munkar, munkar is accepted as maruf; sunnah is accepted as bid'ah, bid'ah is accepted as sunnah. The youth grow up in such situation, and elders become old in the same situation. The candle of Islamic symbols has been blown out; and the strangeness of Islam is increased even more. The number of scholars decreased, numbers of safih (deficient or unsound in intellect/ foolish) and worthless people have increased. Every kind of evil has emerged. Hardship has become more intense. Mischief, corruption has appeared on land and sea because of (the deed) that the hands of men have

earned. But besides everything there is a Muhammadi jamaa'ah who submit to haqq is still present. They will continue their Jihaad against ahl shirk and ahl bid'ah till Qiyamah." (Zaadu'l-Maad, 2/200)

Shawkani says: "No doubt that which canalized all the groups of kufr and all of the mushrik, rejection of haqq and the reason for their staying upon this i'tiqaad is the i'tiqaad of ignorance. Was their i'tiqaad (of the Meccan mushrik) the i'tiqaad of ilm, so that the ignorant i'tiqaad of their brothers regarding the deceased of today can be an excuse for them?" When his opponent said: "But they (grave worshippers) utter the tawhid. Shawkani responds: "If their utterance of tawhid with their mouths is mentioned as tawhid, they are co-associated with the Jew, Christian, mushrik and munafiq in this. If it is the utterance with their actions, their i'tiqaad is the same as the i'tiqaad of the ahl jahiliyyah in idols... On the contrary the i'tiqaad of the mushrik in idols can not reach the level of the i'tiqaad of this grave-worshippers in the dead." (Rasail Salafiyya, 8/35)

The quotations from the scholars clearly shows that without doubt shirk does dominate over the nafs only with ignorance and speaking without knowledge regarding Allah. Now at this point, is it possible for us to say that the mushrik is excused due to his ignorance?

This is the end of the fifth issue. **6- Ilm is one of the rukn of the iman**

The sixth issue is; these scholars had mentioned that: Without doubt, ilm is one of the rukn of iman. For this reason one can only be Muslim when he has sahih ilm regarding the situation he is in. As it is known without doubt iman is the asl of the deen. It is also the condition of actualizing and presenting Islam. It is because the one who has does not have iman, will have no Islam and the one who does not have Islam will have no iman. Likewise when the slave utters shahadatayn it is accepted that he also has iman and he is ruled to be Muslim. If this iman is not contaminated with shirk during the utterance, it will confirm Islam. We understand that his iman is abolished when anything which abandons shahadatayn occurs from him after his state of iman. This will be present with either corruption in ilm which is the first rukn of iman, the statement of heart or corruption in submission which is the second rukn of iman, the deed of the heart, there is no difference. In this case we will pass judgment that the iman and Islam of such person has been corrupted.

Ibn Taymiyyah says: "Iman in the heart will not be accepted as iman without deeds such as loving Allah and RasulAllah etc. Just as merely with suppositions and desires there is no iman. On the contrary it is a condition in the asl of iman that the statement and deed of heart to be present. They were saying that: Iman is knowing by heart, utterance by tongue and acting with the limbs. "If only they had believed in Allah, in the Prophet, and in what hath been revealed to him, never would they have taken them for friends and protectors." (al-Maida 5/81); "But no, by the Lord, they can have no (real) Faith, until they make thee judge in all disputes between them, and find in their souls no resistance against Thy decisions, but accept them with the fullest conviction." (an-Nisa 4/65) As it is seen iman is an asl for its hukm to be stable. Therefore it is stable that whatever conditions iman is described with, it will be valid only when these conditions meet."

Ibn Qayyim says: "They say: Heart has two duties. If these two are not present at the same time one can not be a mu'min. These are duties of marifah and ilm, also love, bowing down and submission. In the same manner without fulfilling the necessity of knowledge and ilm also love, bowing down and submission one can not be a mu'min. Moreover if he abandons these necessities of iman although he had the knowledge of ilm and marifah, he will be far away from iman and greater in state with regards to kufr than the one who is kafir because of his ignorance. Without doubt iman is fard upon every individual. This comprises of knowledge and deed. According to this iman can not be thought of without ilm and deed."

It is understood from this: When a slave performs shirk because of ignorance, we pass judgment that he does not have ilm which is rukn of iman; likewise the abolishment of iman and Islam in this slave.

Out of these six issues and many others, it is clearly understood that: Without doubt these scholars do not excuse the mushrik due to his ignorance. In the same manner they do not take a mushrik in consideration under the title of Muslim. Now when it comes to the fatwa of scholars, they do not make takfir of anyone until the hujjah had been established against them. This is because ignorance is widespread and the knowledge regarding risalah is not much known. As it is directed in the following statement of Ibn Taymiyyah; after mentioning some examples of major shirk he says: "Howsoever these shirk are widespread in todays world, it is because the callers of ilm and iman are short and the nabawi call has weakened in so many cities. Many of them do not have any books of risalah which they can learn hidayah from or the inheritance of nubuwwah. The foundation of this is: Without doubt it is said regarding the statements of kufr which is according to the Book, Sunnah and ijma: They are absolutely kufr...Likewise this is what the shari evidences indicate. Surely iman is due to rulings which are considered from Allah and RasulAllah. This is not an issue which people are convicted by their supposition and hawa. Therefore it does not necessitate saying for every individual that he is kafir because he said/did this. Till the conditions of takfir and preventions of it are lifted for him." (Fatawa, 35/164-165)